

SOCIALIZATION FOR MARITAL ROLES  
AMONG SELECT YOUNG ADULT MARRIAGES:  
A MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF MEDIA INFLUENCE  
IN RELATION TO PARENTS AND PEERS

---

A Dissertation  
Presented to  
the Faculty of  
the School of Theology at Claremont

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by  
Ronald Lee Hines  
June 1976

*This dissertation, written by*

Ronald Lee Hines

---

*under the direction of his Faculty Committee,  
and approved by its members, has been presented  
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of  
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of*

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

*Faculty Committee*

Allen J. Moore  
Chairman

Harold L. ...

Forest Harrison

---

Date May 12, 1976

Joseph C. Hays, Jr.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My intellectual and personal debts are many. Allen J. Moore was a most helpful guide and motivator from my first strugglings to define the problem to the approval of the final draft. Forest Harrison turned data analysis into a real adventure and was often generous with his time in helping me break through to new insight. Jack Coogan will recognize in my approach to data analysis my debt to his introducing me to another tool of discovery, the camera. David R. Griffin helped me to sharpen the philosophical and theological perspectives in Chapter 2. Hunter Beaumont, Granville Henry, and John B. Cobb, Jr. read portions of the manuscript and made useful suggestions. Important home away from home, both physical and psychic, was provided by Steve and Lynn Jackson, Ann Knight, Harold Knight, and Bob and Joyce Lamphere at crucial stages of my work. Jeanne Aston and June Whitson ably tackled monumental typing tasks, and Doris Melnichenko and Ruth Ely also provided useful typing help. David L. Aasen, minister, and members of the First United Methodist Church, Seattle, Washington, were very supportive and patient with me as I completed my work while being a minister with them. I am especially indebted to my wife Lois, not only for her professional contribution of skills in librarianship, but for bearing with me the strain of labor. Her labor in the birth of Kirsten, which I joyfully shared, was more dramatic, more concentrated, but her sharing of my labor in bringing this project to fruition was nevertheless just as real, often intense, and finally, gratifying. It is to Lois and to Kirsten that this work is dedicated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                 | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| PREFACE . . . . .                                                               | 1    |
| Chapter                                                                         |      |
| 1. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM IN CONTEXT. . . . .                                     | 5    |
| HYPOTHESES AND DEFINITIONS . . . . .                                            | 5    |
| Socialization for Marital Roles. . . . .                                        | 6    |
| Media Influence in Relation to Parents and Peers . . . . .                      | 8    |
| Multivariate Analysis . . . . .                                                 | 10   |
| Among Select Young Adult Marriages . . . . .                                    | 11   |
| Definitions' Relation to Research-Theory-Practice. . . . .                      | 12   |
| PRACTICE . . . . .                                                              | 14   |
| RESEARCH . . . . .                                                              | 19   |
| Parameters of Research . . . . .                                                | 20   |
| Relevant Findings. . . . .                                                      | 27   |
| THEORY . . . . .                                                                | 32   |
| A Symbolic Interactionist Theory of Socialization. . . . .                      | 34   |
| Media Influence Marital Roles. . . . .                                          | 42   |
| SUMMARY OF THE OPERATIONAL MODEL . . . . .                                      | 63   |
| Sexual Roles . . . . .                                                          | 64   |
| Marital Roles. . . . .                                                          | 65   |
| Companionate Roles . . . . .                                                    | 65   |
| Parental Roles . . . . .                                                        | 65   |
| Leisure Roles . . . . .                                                         | 66   |
| Economic Roles . . . . .                                                        | 66   |
| 2. PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE<br>INVESTIGATION . . . . . | 69   |
| EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION CONTRIBUTES TO THE THEOLOGICAL<br>TASK . . . . .        | 73   |
| The Scientific Worldview and the God it Displaced. . . . .                      | 73   |
| Process Worldview and its Renewal of Science and<br>Theology . . . . .          | 80   |
| How Empirical Inquiry May contribute to Theology . . . . .                      | 97   |
| A THEOLOGICAL VISION UNDERLIES THE CONDUCT OF THIS STUDY .102                   |      |
| The Vision's Effects on the Problem Statement. . . . .                          | 103  |
| The Vision's Effects on Theory Formulation . . . . .                            | 107  |
| The Vision's Effects on Research Methodology . . . . .                          | 109  |
| THE CONDUCT OF EMPIRICAL INQUIRY WITH THEOLOGICAL IMPORT .111                   |      |
| Family Study and Symbolic Interactionist Perspective . .113                     |      |
| Loving Data Toward Order and Relevant Novelty. . . . .                          | 121  |
| Religious Education: Theology Enhanced by Imaginative<br>Empiricism . . . . .   | 141  |



|                                                                |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES. . . . .                     | 147 |
| DESIGN. . . . .                                                | 147 |
| Survey-Comparative-Experimental Designs . . . . .              | 148 |
| Secondary Analysis. . . . .                                    | 150 |
| SAMPLING. . . . .                                              | 152 |
| Sampling Procedures and Survey Administration . . . . .        | 152 |
| Sample Description. . . . .                                    | 154 |
| Population. . . . .                                            | 156 |
| INSTRUMENTATION . . . . .                                      | 157 |
| Measurement . . . . .                                          | 158 |
| Validity and Reliability. . . . .                              | 159 |
| ANALYSIS . . . . .                                             | 160 |
| Data Handling and Statistics. . . . .                          | 160 |
| Procedures. . . . .                                            | 161 |
| Statistical Model . . . . .                                    | 166 |
| DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON ROLES . . . . .                            | 169 |
| Sexual Roles. . . . .                                          | 170 |
| Marital Roles . . . . .                                        | 173 |
| Companionate Roles. . . . .                                    | 177 |
| Parental Roles. . . . .                                        | 180 |
| Leisure Roles . . . . .                                        | 183 |
| Economic Roles. . . . .                                        | 185 |
| DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON AGENTS. . . . .                            | 189 |
| Media . . . . .                                                | 189 |
| Parents . . . . .                                              | 192 |
| Peers . . . . .                                                | 194 |
| 4. EXPLORATORY FINDINGS: CLUES TO CLASSIFICATION. . . . .      | 197 |
| COMPARATIVE MEDIA SAMPLES . . . . .                            | 199 |
| MEDIA SAMPLES DESCRIBED                                        |     |
| WITH RESPECT TO PARENT SAMPLES. . . . .                        | 206 |
| MEDIA SAMPLES DESCRIBED                                        |     |
| WITH RESPECT TO PEER SAMPLES. . . . .                          | 211 |
| RATIONALE FOR CHOICE OF CLASSIFIERS . . . . .                  | 220 |
| 5. CONFIRMATORY FINDINGS: MEDIA INFLUENCE ON MARITAL ROLES . . | 224 |
| SEX ROLES . . . . .                                            | 226 |
| MARITAL ROLES . . . . .                                        | 231 |
| COMPANION ROLES . . . . .                                      | 235 |
| PARENTAL ROLES. . . . .                                        | 240 |
| LEISURE ROLES . . . . .                                        | 243 |
| ECONOMIC ROLES. . . . .                                        | 246 |
| SUMMARY OF ONE-WAY EFFECTS OF "MOVIESED". . . . .              | 249 |

|                                                                                                        | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| INTERACTIONS. . . . .                                                                                  | 250  |
| Sexual Roles . . . . .                                                                                 | 251  |
| Marital Roles . . . . .                                                                                | 253  |
| Companionate Roles. . . . .                                                                            | 254  |
| Parental Roles. . . . .                                                                                | 256  |
| Leisure Roles . . . . .                                                                                | 256  |
| Economic Roles. . . . .                                                                                | 257  |
| Summary . . . . .                                                                                      | 258  |
| ROLE PRESCRIPTIONS: A SUMMARY OF EFFECTS . . . . .                                                     | 259  |
| Firmest Effects of MOVIESED . . . . .                                                                  | 260  |
| Unaffected Prescriptions. . . . .                                                                      | 262  |
| Tabular Summary of Role Prescriptions Affected. . . . .                                                | 263  |
| 6. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS. . . . .                                             | 267  |
| CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .                                                              | 267  |
| Confirmatory . . . . .                                                                                 | 267  |
| Exploratory . . . . .                                                                                  | 279  |
| Synthesis of Confirmatory and Exploratory Conclusions .                                                | 300  |
| IMPLICATIONS . . . . .                                                                                 | 302  |
| For Research. . . . .                                                                                  | 302  |
| For Theory. . . . .                                                                                    | 307  |
| For Practice. . . . .                                                                                  | 315  |
| REFERENCES. . . . .                                                                                    | 320  |
| APPENDICES. . . . .                                                                                    | 338  |
| A Marital Style Inventory. . . . .                                                                     | 339  |
| B Record Definition. . . . .                                                                           | 354  |
| C Statistical Model. . . . .                                                                           | 357  |
| D Descriptive Data . . . . .                                                                           | 359  |
| E Exploratory Data . . . . .                                                                           | 369  |
| F Parsimonious Model of 1-Way Effects, when<br>MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are Classifiers. . . . . | 374  |
| G 2- and 3-Way Interaction Effects, when<br>MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are Classifiers. . . . .    | 392  |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table |                                                                                                         | Page |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 3.1   | Frequency Distributions: Selected Marital<br>Role Variables. . . . .                                    | 175  |
| 3.2   | Frequency of Response to #163, Influences in Learning<br>about and Preparation for Marriage. . . . .    | 190  |
| 3.3   | Frequency of Contact with Parents, Peers and Media . .                                                  | 195  |
| 4.1   | Ranked Percentages of Persons Checking "PR-" Items<br>for RSET 3 and "Pure" Magazine Samples. . . . .   | 202  |
| 4.2   | Ranked Percentages of Persons Checking "PR-" Items<br>for RSET 4 and "Pure" Television Samples. . . . . | 203  |
| 5.1   | Role Prescription Effects Associated with<br>HIGH MOVIESED. . . . .                                     | 264  |
| 5.2.1 | Role Prescription Effects Associated with<br>HIGH FRENDTIM. . . . .                                     | 265  |
| 5.2.2 | Role Prescription Effects Associated with<br>LOW FRENDTIM . . . . .                                     | 265  |
| 5.3.1 | Role Prescription Effects Associated with<br>close PRNTREL. . . . .                                     | 266  |
| 5.3.2 | Role Prescription Effects Associated with<br>distant PRNTREL. . . . .                                   | 266  |
| 6.1   | Classification of 3-Way Interacting Variates. . . . .                                                   | 283  |
| D     | Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .                                                                 | 359  |
| D-1   | Sexual Variables . . . . .                                                                              | 359  |
| D-2   | Marital Variables. . . . .                                                                              | 360  |
| D-3   | Companion Variables. . . . .                                                                            | 361  |
| D-4   | Parental Variables. . . . .                                                                             | 362  |
| D-5   | Leisure Variables. . . . .                                                                              | 363  |
| D-6   | Economic Variables . . . . .                                                                            | 364  |
| D-7   | Media Variables . . . . .                                                                               | 365  |
| D-8   | Parents Variables. . . . .                                                                              | 366  |
| D-9   | Peers Variables . . . . .                                                                               | 367  |
| D-10  | Demographic Variables. . . . .                                                                          | 368  |
| E-1   | Product Moment Correlations . . . . .                                                                   | 369  |
| E-1.1 | Among Media Classifiers. . . . .                                                                        | 369  |
| E-1.2 | Among Parent Classifiers . . . . .                                                                      | 369  |
| E-1.3 | Among Peer Classifiers . . . . .                                                                        | 369  |

## Table

## Page

|       |                                                                                                                              |     |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| E-2   | Means and Standard Deviations for RSET Sub-samples<br>Indicating "Pure" Response or Non-Response on<br>Question 163. . . . . | 370 |
| E-2.1 | Media Means. . . . .                                                                                                         | 370 |
| E-2.2 | Parent Means . . . . .                                                                                                       | 371 |
| E-2.3 | Peer Means . . . . .                                                                                                         | 372 |
| E-2.4 | Demographic Means. . . . .                                                                                                   | 373 |
| F     | Role Variates: Parsimonious Model of 1-Way Effects . .                                                                       | 374 |
| F-1   | Sexual Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                               | 374 |
| F-2   | Marital Role Variates. . . . .                                                                                               | 375 |
| F-3   | Companion Role Variates. . . . .                                                                                             | 376 |
| F-4   | Parental Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                             | 377 |
| F-5   | Leisure Role Variates. . . . .                                                                                               | 378 |
| F-6   | Economic Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                             | 379 |
| F     | Role Variates: Parsimonious Model<br>Cell Means and Standard Deviations. . . . .                                             | 380 |
| F-7   | Sexual Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                               | 380 |
| F-8   | Marital Role Variates. . . . .                                                                                               | 382 |
| F-9   | Companionate Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                         | 384 |
| F-10  | Parental Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                             | 386 |
| F-11  | Leisure Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                              | 388 |
| F-12  | Economic Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                             | 390 |
| G     | Role Variates: 2- and 3-Way Interaction Effects. . . .                                                                       | 392 |
| G-1   | Sexual Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                               | 392 |
| G-2   | Marital Role Variates. . . . .                                                                                               | 393 |
| G-3   | Companionate Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                         | 394 |
| G-4   | Parental Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                             | 395 |
| G-5   | Leisure Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                              | 396 |
| G-6   | Economic Role Variates . . . . .                                                                                             | 397 |

## ABSTRACT

This investigation confirmed the primary hypothesis, that media influence marital roles, and its qualifying secondary hypothesis, that they do so in interaction with parent and peer influences. The research problem grew out of practical concern of marriage and family life professionals that, for good or ill, media models influence young couples in their preparation for marriage. The hypotheses were related to a symbolic interactionist theory of adult socialization, as well as to findings of mass communications research.

Both exploratory and confirmatory operations were performed, using secondary analysis of data gathered with the Marital Style Inventory (Compaan, 1973) from a sample of white, middle-class, Protestant church-related couples married six years or less, aged 19-30 and living in the Pacific Southwest. Exploratory work identified comparative sub-samples classified by high and low influence from media, parents, and/or peers. Confirmatory work used multivariate analysis of variance to test the effects of media, parent, and peer classifiers on variates representing six role dimensions--sexual, marital, companionate, parental, leisure, and economic. Parsimonious statistical models of 1-way effects and of 2- and 3-way interaction effects are reported, using agreement that movies have been an education for one's marriage (MOVIESED), the reported degree of closeness in one's relationship to parents (PRNTREL), and the reported amount of time spent with a friend (FRENDTIM) to classify media, parent, and peer effects. Statistical models were further qualified by substantive significance.

Role positions and prescriptions for all six role dimensions were affected by movies. Of 109 variates used to represent the role dimensions, 29 were included in the parsimonious model of M-way effects, with another 7 univariately significant but eliminated through redundancy in the sexual and marital role dimensions. In terms of variance accounted for in the multivariate model, MOVIESED had the greatest effect on the sexual (25%) and marital (16%) roles, lesser effects on companionate (10%), parental (12%) and leisure (11%) roles, and least effect on the economic roles (5.3%). To summarize the most firm findings, among those who acknowledge their influence, movies' effect upon marital role expectations was to increase open communication about sex, to increase the value attached to the sexual relationship, to reduce opposition to alternative definitions of marriage, and to facilitate intimate sharing of personal experiences. Movies also liberalized attitudes about sex, abortion, and the feminist movement, and reinforced smaller family size as response to the population crisis. Movies encouraged sex as play, marriage as fulfilling personal needs, companionship as facilitating personal growth, and natural childbirth as the preferred mode. Preliminary tests indicated that these movie effects cannot be simply generalized to other media, but the effects did remain despite the removal through analysis of covariance of certain effects of sex, religious outlook, socio-economic status and other demographic factors.

Data are presented which allow comparison of these media effects to parent and peer effects. For every role dimension, some 2- or 3-way interaction effects were discovered, with the greatest number of interactions discovered for the dimensions in which the M-way effect had been most pronounced, that of sexual and marital roles. Exploratory analysis of sub-samples and interaction effects generated hypotheses which summarize the effects of interpersonal dynamics on the appropriation of media models.

Based on conclusions from the above findings, recommendations and implications for research, theory and practice were given. Using concepts from process thought, a philosophical and theological perspective on the investigation explicitly identified the value assumptions underlying the choice of problem, theoretical stance, and methodology. This study's exploratory/confirmatory approach to data analysis, compatible with the state of marriage and family research and with symbolic interactionist theory, was seen as a paradigm for the way in which empirical science and theological inquiry may inform one another, especially in the field of religious education.

## PREFACE

Antagonism toward both popular movies and science was part of my upbringing in a strict, religious atmosphere. The happy privilege of serving as research assistant to Dr. Allen J. Moore provided exposure to data on young adult marriage which allowed exploration, using scientific method, of media influence on marriage. Thus, I had a specific way to come to grips with both movies and science, and that in the area of marriage, the definition of which by the culture at large was subject to different norms than those with which I grew up. The present study serves not only as an investigation of an important problem area, but also as a paradigm for the way a professional religious educator may appropriate scientific method in the practice of ministry and theological reflection upon such practice.

Chapter 1 states the problem and sets it in context. Two hypotheses are presented--primarily, that media influence marital roles, and secondarily, that they do so in interaction with parent and peer influences. Definitions are presented for terms in the title of the investigation: "Socialization for marital roles among select young adult marriages: Media influence in relation to parents and peers." Then, the problem is discussed as it arises in the *practice* of education for marriage, as it is informed by relevant mass communications *research*, and as it reflects a symbolic interactionist *theory* of adult socialization. Six role dimensions--sexual, marital, companionate, parental, leisure and economic--are defined in terms of role positions and prescriptions, indicating the way in which the roles will be made operational for this investigation.

Despite widespread practical concern that marriage demands adequate preparation and that media may serve as marriage models (adequate or not), there is little empirical research on media influence on marital roles. Mass media research findings lead us to believe that media do serve as role models, but that media influence interacts with interpersonal influences. Both practical concern and research findings are related to a symbolic interactionist theory accounting for media influence on marital roles. Marriage is seen as "social object," defined, at least in part, by media "definitions" of the situation. Thus, media do socialize by providing role models. Media socialization may either broaden or limit one's effective experience of social reality and may be either moderated or enhanced by interpersonal agents.

Chapter 2 presents philosophical and theological perspectives on the investigation. The underdeveloped state of our understanding of the problem, as well as a theoretical perspective which is cautious about too narrow definitions of empirical reality, demands a methodology which includes exploration, as well as confirmation, in order to penetrate the problem. Since methodological discussion has usually underplayed exploratory aspects of investigation, considerable attention is given to the way in which empirical investigation may benefit from, as well as contribute to, philosophical and theological thought. First, it is argued that empirical investigation contributes to the theological task. Second, the theological vision which underlies the conduct of the study is made explicit with respect to values underlying its problem statement, theory formulation, and research methodology. Third, an exploratory/confirmatory approach to the conduct of empirical inquiry is presented as a methodology consistent with the state of marriage and family research,



with symbolic interactionist theory, and with the investigator's values as a religious educator.

Scientific method, with its dual concern for stubborn fact and general principles, has itself been hampered by a narrowed vision of reality (which excluded God), so that order and novelty became difficult to account for. Whitehead's cosmological vision and his analysis of perception is presented as a more adequate way of understanding fundamental reality and the way we relate to it. Both scientific and theological inquiry are renewed by a more adequate empiricism which recognizes the uses and limits of the conceptual tools of imaginative research. The work of science is seen as symbolic transformation, a response to the God who calls us forward by creative transformation. Empirical investigation helps to identify God's aims (at harmony and intensity) in sustaining world order, and it takes responsibility for enhancing those aims. Exploratory/confirmatory data analysis is presented as a means of loving data toward order and relevant novelty. Implications are drawn for the investigator's field of religious education.

Chapter 3 presents the research design and procedures. The study is a comparative design, using secondary analysis of survey data to identify effects on marital roles of high and low media-, parent-, and peer influence. The method and the resulting sample is described and the population parameters discussed. Discussion of the research instrument includes measurement, validity and reliability. Data analysis and statistical procedures, both exploratory and confirmatory, are presented and independent, dependent, and demographic variables are identified. Descriptive data are presented at the end of the chapter for the six marital role dimensions and the three socialization agents.

Chapter 4 presents exploratory findings as clues to classifying the sample in search of comparative sub-samples along media, parent, and peer dimensions. Inter-relations among the media variables will lead to hypothesized media sub-samples, which provide the organizing principle for the report of exploratory findings. Media sub-samples will be described with respect to parent and peer samples. Ultimately, the chapter presents a rationale for the choice of classifiers for the confirmatory model.

Chapter 5 presents the confirmatory findings which test the hypothesis, "Media influence marital roles." A parsimonious statistical model will present the results of one-way analysis of variance, indicating the effects on marital roles of the classification into high and low media groups. The statistical model will be substantively qualified by reference to cell mean trends, not-quite-significant findings, and effects of interactions with parents and media. Media effects will be compared to parent and peer effects and specific interactions of parents, peers and media will be reported. Effects will be summarized with respect to the role prescriptions presented in Chapter 1.

Chapter 6 presents conclusions, recommendations and implications. Conclusions will be presented for both confirmatory and exploratory findings, with recommendations for further research. The limitations of the confirmatory findings will be discussed, including their strength when other sources of variation are accounted for. Exploratory findings based on media, parent and peer sub-samples and interaction effects will be summarized as hypotheses which indicate the effects of interpersonal dynamics on the appropriation of media models. Implications are drawn for research, theory and practice.

## Chapter 1

### THE RESEARCH PROBLEM IN CONTEXT

This chapter states the research problem and its context. The hypotheses and definitions which guide the investigations are stated, then elaborated in terms of practice, research, and theory, and finally summarized as an operational model with specific variables.

### HYPOTHESES AND DEFINITIONS

The central theme of this investigation is summed up in two hypotheses:

- 1) Mass media influence marital role-definitions (meaning by "influence", some predictable association of media use and marital roles),
- 2) Media do so, however, in interaction with parents and peers.

This investigation hypothesizes media influence on marital roles, recognizing that such influence interacts with parent and peer influences. The study seeks to confirm in a 3-way multivariate analysis of variance a parsimonious model which will explain variation in marital roles in terms of joint or isolated effects of media, parent and peer influences. The hypotheses are stated in broad terms, since the area of investigation is new. Exploration is needed in order to fill in details of the broadly conceived problem area.

The primary focus of the investigation shall be on the first hypothesis, with the secondary hypothesis treated chiefly as a qualification of the first. Both are reflected in the stated title of the investigation, "Socialization for marital roles among select young

adult marriages: A multivariate analysis of media influence in relation to parents and peers." Key phrases in the problem statement are defined below.

#### Socialization for Marital Roles

"Socialization for marital roles" will be taken as a single phrase requiring definition. The generic "socialization" is focused by attention to "roles," further confined by relevance to marriage. "Adult socialization" (Sewell, 1963; Clausen, 1968; Brim, 1968), an emerging field of inquiry, narrows the socialization focus to that social experience which can be conceptualized as role learning, and yet it places the problem of marital role learning in a broad stream of investigation of developing social processes throughout the life cycle, from early childhood to old age. Definitions usually reflect socialization to be "a general area of interest, not a sharply definable process" (Clausen, 1968, p. 5). Though the general area is defined similarly across many disciplines, the generic term is usually particularized by one's perspective, whether psychoanalysis, cultural anthropology, social learning theory, or sociology. The decision to approach adult socialization in terms of symbolic interaction theory does not imply a denial of other socialization foci, but a judgment of the utility of this conceptual framework for examining media influence on socialization for marriage. The present study stands

in the tradition of studies<sup>1</sup> which refer to foundations laid by  
Brim (1966), who defined socialization as

the process by which individuals acquire the knowledge, skills,  
and dispositions that enable them to participate as more or less  
effective members of groups and the society (1966, p. 3).<sup>2</sup>

Brim limited his own focus of attention by particular reference  
to adult socialization studies which conceptualized socialization as

learning new roles, and as the individual's adaptation to society's  
demands for changes in his social behavior as he moved from one  
position to the next (1966, p.6).

The *function* of socialization is "to transform the human raw material of  
society into good working members" (Brim, 1966, p.5). Stryker (1964,  
p.133) articulated this focus as an expansion of the child rearing  
concern to cover the entire range of relations developed over time  
between a neophyte and an organized social unit. Brim analyzed the  
*content* of socialization with reference to role *positions*, which locate  
others and self in a social structure, and role *prescriptions*, the  
behavior and associated modes of feeling associated with various  
positions. The terms "position" and "prescription" are widely used in

---

<sup>1</sup> Other marriage and family studies of socialization for which  
Brim's work is basic include Hill & Aldous (1969) and Kerckhoff (1972).

<sup>2</sup> Clausen (1968) reviews socialization definitions reflecting  
diverse perspectives in his discussion of adult socialization. Stryker  
(1959, 1964) discusses symbolic interactionism as a theory of sociali-  
zation, and Elkin (1960) and Dager (1964) discuss child socialization  
from this perspective. Useful definitions can also be found in Zigler  
& Child (1969, 1973) and Stendenbach (1966). In general these  
definitions all see socialization as a *process* which relates *individuals*  
in their *behavior* to *society* with some *normative expectations*. These  
elements are all present in Brim's definition, which has the advantage  
of more specific relation to the line of investigation pursued in this  
study.

many sociological perspectives. In this investigation they are used with the understanding that these *social* roles, which serve as categories for identifying people and anticipating some normative expectations in regard to them, are often only broadly defined parameters, requiring the person to improvise *interactive* roles within the broad demands of social position and one's own character (McCall & Simmons, 1966, p. 6-7, 58-9, 66-7). Hill & Aldous (1969, p. 886) indicated that marriage roles, only recently salient as distinct from parental roles, are less likely to be scripted, "requiring, therefore, more improvisations in performance."

"Socialization for Marital Roles" will be further elaborated in the theory section of this chapter (p.32f). The way "marital roles" are operationalized for this investigation is briefly indicated on p.63ff and elaborated in Chapter 3, especially p. 167ff.

#### Media Influence in Relation to Parents and Peers

"Media influence in relation to parents and peers" not only needs to be defined as a whole phrase, but also in relation to previous definition of "socialization for marital roles." The influence of "mass media"--particularly books, magazines, television and movies--is here conceptualized as "socialization agent," or means of effecting role learning in the adult socialization process. Reasons for focus on media, when other such agents may be presumed,<sup>3</sup> are explicated in the

---

<sup>3</sup> Some agents for which we might hypothesize effective influence, and for which some account can be given by reference to the data base for this study, include religion, socio-economic status, education, relatives, professionals such as counselors, clergy, doctors and teachers. See Chapter 3, p. 154f, 168.

"practice" section of this chapter (p. 14). After that choice, "parents and peers" must be included because of their recognized importance in the socialization process.<sup>4</sup> The primary focus, however, is not on the acknowledged influence of parents and peers, but on the media, for which little research is available. The examination of media "in relation to parents and peers" not only meets the demands of socialization theory; it also provides a link with a growing body of empirical research in which presumed media effects are seen to operate in conjunction with social interaction (McQuail, 1969, p. 54-57).

The focus on mass media does not imply any theoretical attention to the problem of "mass" culture,<sup>5</sup> but merely the reference to widely available, mass-produced means of communication. Variations in types of media (e.g., television or film), dominant use patterns (educational or leisure), or supposed quality ("high brow" or "low brow") cannot be examined here. Some such differences may be noted in the report of exploratory findings, Chapter 4. The confirmatory model reported in Chapter 5 defines media influence exclusively in terms of response to the item: "Contemporary movies have been an education for our marriage." Rationale for this selection is discussed in Chapter 4, p. 220f.

---

<sup>4</sup> Parental influence is a major theme in studies of early childhood. Peer influence is especially indicated by the interaction approach to adult socialization.

<sup>5</sup> McQuail (1969, p. 29-35) is critical of the "mass culture" approach to media. This approach to industrialized society projects an image which is "an accentuation of largely undesirable elements--insecurity, impersonality, alienation, trivialization, manipulation--and understandably the consequences attributed to the typical communication system of such a society have been predominantly harmful."

The problem of self-selection arises if one thinks of the causal influence of media, conceived as an independent variable, upon roles, conceived as dependent. Since such self-selection is unavoidable, "influence" is to be seen as a relative term, a selection of perspective on the problem. From an interaction viewpoint it is at least as useful to ask, "What do people do with media?" as to ask, "What do media do to people?" By media "influence" some predictable association of media use and marital roles is hypothesized.

"Media influence in relation to parents and peers" is further elaborated especially in the "research" and "theory" sections of this chapter.

### Multivariate Analysis

"Multivariate analysis" not only indicates the use of multiple variables to represent the problem, but indicates that these are ultimately related in a linear model such as multivariate analysis of variance. This model is differentiated from the use of the term by Denzin (1970) for the correlational techniques of *elaboration* and *specification* in the survey tradition developed by Lazarsfeld (1955) and elaborated with specific reference to secondary analysis of survey data by Hyman (1971). Rather, an analysis of variance technique is used which organizes survey data into a comparative design (Bock, 1967), which provides contrasts of extreme "treatment" groups by partitioning total variance into between-cell effects and within-cell error,<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> A random error term is also included in the statistical model, and if there are two or more classifiers, an interaction effect. Hays (1973, p. 457f) explains the underlying analysis of variance model in its univariate application.



allowing an F-test for significance by the ratio between them. The technique is explained by Tatsuka & Tiedeman (1963), Bock (1971), Morrison (1967), Cooley & Lohnes (1971), and Tatsuka (1971). Its specific application to survey data is discussed by Pruzek (1971). Even the univariate application of analysis of variance techniques allows use of multiple classifiers and tests for effects attributable to the interaction(s) between them, a concept well explained by Hays (1973, p. 494-9). Further, the multivariate application indicates effects for unique configurations of variates, taking account of the inter-correlations among them, and providing a multiple R which may be used to estimate total variance accounted for by the model. The problem of this investigation is posed by use of both multiple *independent* variables, representing the socialization agents by the 3-way classification, Media, Parents, Peers, and multiple *dependent* variables, with socialized roles treated as criterion sets. The study's design and analytic procedures, and descriptive data on the variables are presented in detail in Chapter 3.

#### Among Select Young Adult Marriages

"Among select young adult marriages" indicates not only a focus on young adult marriage, since preparation for marital roles is the problem of interest, but it also indicates a specific sample. A survey sample drawn by Compaan (1973) provides the data base upon which secondary analysis is performed. Instrumentation, sampling procedures, and sample description are described in Chapter 3, p.157ff. There, specific variables selected from Compaan's 1971 survey are referred to

a multivariate statistical model relating marital roles to media influence in interaction with parent and peer influences.

### Definitions' Relation to Research-Theory-Practice

The above definitions have been referred to remaining sections of Chapter 1 and to Chapter 3. Further discussion of practice, research, and theory which inform this investigation, requires clarification of the mutual interplay of these elements. The task is complicated by the diversity of perspectives which are joined in the terms "socialization," "marital roles," "media influence." Each term intimates a particular tradition of practice, research and theory which has its own integrity. In face of such diversity informing the problem of media influence in marital socialization, one cannot merely give a nod to the practitioner's plea for information, add up facts already accumulated through a line of empirical research, and finally peak out in theoretical propositions which summarize what is known and hand down hypotheses for judgment as possible future facts. Rather, in quest of what is relevant to insistent concerns arising in practice, one must refer independent theories and diverse research findings to one another. This inevitably involves the investigator in the problem of choice of perspectives.

The selection of just certain definite evidence, difficult in any research, is especially difficult for a cross-disciplinary problem. The bibliographic search strategy for this investigation was complicated by the paucity of material directly relevant to both the problem and the sample, combined with the plethora of interesting, tangentially relevant material referenced under descriptors like "socialization," "roles," "marriage," "media," "communication," etc. The task of imaginative

selection is thrust to the foreground. There is not yet an "obvious" research tradition with definite variables, unambiguous relations, and clear-cut issues. No "obvious" theoretical propositions demand tests against the null hypothesis. The hypotheses for this study are broadly stated, greatly influenced by the practical concerns of professionals involved with marriage education. Exploration must fill in details, specify variables and designate predictable relationships. With so few prefabricated details to be built into a research tradition bridging the practical concern and the increasingly firm conclusions of theoretical propositions, this study must be especially sensitive to the necessary contribution made by each of these perspectives: the practical involvement by professionals with young married adults or persons preparing for marriage, the findings of experimental and survey research to test the effects of media on their audiences, and finally the theoretical orientation which allows discussion of both media and interpersonal influence as symbolic interaction, the process whereby one becomes a social self.

The presented definitions reflect the investigator's choices regarding the way to appropriate each term. The problem is framed in relation to a specific line of research chiefly proposed by Brim (1966) and Hill & Aldous (1969). While they offer little explicit research on media influence, they provide a useful theoretical framework. The chief contribution of this study of socialization for marital roles is to refer mass communications research and adult socialization theory to one another within the disciplined exploration of a specific body of data. To test broad hypotheses and clarify them for further research past research, theory, and yet another empirical base are referred to

one another to extend a possible line of future research-theory-practice.

With little empirical data explicitly investigating media influence on marital socialization, the interplay of research, theory and practice serves to penetrate a problem area which, though widely felt to be a problem, has not been clarified through empirical research. A new problem area requires flexible procedures which penetrate the problem as well as codify existing propositions, which generate new hypotheses as well as test existing ones. Therefore, particular attention is given to the theoretical grounds for the selected research procedures. Chapter 1, after discussing the problem and its context, clarifies also a methodological perspective which relates this research to a broad macro-view of the heuristic procedures of science.

#### PRACTICE

The influence of media in socialization and more particularly in learning marital roles has been felt as a real problem from a variety of perspectives. Though no long-standing research tradition explicitly investigates this concern, some practical prerequisites to the framing of this question include first, the recognition that marital roles are subject to socialization, and second, that media do indeed serve as agents in this task.

The first prerequisite involves a focus on the marital dimension per se and learning in preparation for it. Burgess' (Burgess, Locke, and Thomes, 1971) work on the emergence of "companionate" marriage is an indication of such a focus on spouse relationships. Hill & Aldous (1969) have identified the focus on the *marital* dimension

as a recent development in American family life studies. The focus on learning processes has been a growing concern throughout the Nineteenth Century and culminating in Dewey's concern that education perform a pragmatic function in support of democratic ideals. A large research tradition has emerged in the educational field. The focus on learning is also indicated by self-consciousness about child-rearing practices spurred in part by the modern emphasis on the child and its development and by reports of child rearing practices of other cultures (e.g., Aberle, 1961; Whiting, 1963). When this emphasis on the sociocultural contribution to learning is applied to the marital dimension, then there is a recognition that marriage involves social learning (Clausen, 1968, p. 3-4; Gagnon & Simon, 1973) and not merely instinctual maturation ("doin' what comes natcherly"). The concern for proper child rearing has been a major impetus to the parent education movement (Brim, 1959; Hereford, 1963; Menchan, 1969). To provide support to the home, the place for proper child rearing, therapeutic marriage counseling has emerged (Ellis, 1956) as well as a family life education movement (Folsom, 1941; Bowman, 1960; Bee, 1952; Peterson, 1964; "The Family Life Educator of the Future," 1971). This latter movement focused on preparing persons for marriage and its responsibilities through formal education, a concern which has been broadened in sex education, a concern both to churches (Wynn, 1966) and family life educators. Ministers, under the influence of the pastoral counseling movement, have increasingly been concerned for pre-marital counseling as part of their function in connection with the performance of marriage rites. A broad research tradition, too diverse and voluminous to be summarized in the research section of this chapter, nevertheless demonstrates the

attention given to marriage as subject to socialization. The *Journal on Marriage and the Family* contains studies in mate selection, marital adjustment, interpersonal competence, sexual adequacy, and other indicators of concern that skills be learned to allow marriages to approach normative expectations. The widespread dissemination of marriage manuals also indicates that marriage is widely considered to be a position for which one may learn certain role prescriptions.

Some of the above (Brim, Hereford, Peterson, Gagnon and Simon) have explicitly discussed the relation of media to marriage, indicating that the second prerequisite is also present, that is, the feeling that media do indeed serve as an agent for socialization. Brim (1959) and Hereford (1963) specifically discussed the use of and limits of mass media approaches to parent education. Others (Murphy, 1956; Udry, 1968; Bronfenbrenner, 1970) contrasted the rising influence of media (along with peer groups and school instruction) with the declining influence of the parental family (and the churches).<sup>7</sup> This concern for increasing media influence must be seen in relation to the host of factors comprising the emergence of the modern industrialized state (McQuail, 1969, p. 1-6). At least one church group has called for the study of the family in relation to other societal influences, including the media (Committee on Family Life, 1972). Early research of the effects of movies on youth was motivated by this concern for the influence of the rising new institutions of mass communication in relation to the

---

<sup>7</sup> Despite the contrast of media, peers and schools with the declining influence of the church and family, religious behavior is often considered an important variable, especially in studies of sexual behavior.

supposed decline of traditional institutions' influence. One of the investigators on the series of Payne Fund Studies, Blumer (1933, p. 197), in reference to the "schemes of conduct" which motion pictures present, said that they "may not only fill the gaps left by the school, by the home and by the church, but they may also cut athwart the standards and values which these latter institutions seek to inculcate." Burgess, Locke & Thomes (1971, p. 461), reporting data on the ubiquitousness of mass media, conceived of the role which "agencies of communication" play as promoting "ideational mobility" by introducing persons to "ways of behavior divergent from those sanctioned by the family, the school, and the church." This feeling that persons might learn something from media which would affect their marital roles was also expressed by Hill & Aldous (1969, p. 901), but they saw media as a positive influence providing models of marriage which supplement the limitations of the parental family.

The assumption that media do indeed teach is formulated in a number of places outside the marriage and family tradition. An extensive research tradition has documented media efficacy in formal instruction (Lumsdaine & May, 1965). Others have tried to capitalize on the unintentional learning from popular media in making classroom learning more relevant (Culkin, 1965). There has been further concern about unintentional learning from media which is not even related to formal training, resulting in a great deal of research on the impact of various media on children and adolescents (UNESCO, 1961; UNESCO, 1964; European Committee on Crime Problems, 1968; Himmelweit, Oppenheim & Vince, 1958; Schramm, Lyle & Parker, 1961). The twin themes of sex and violence in much media research and criticism (*Television and*

*Social Behavior*, 1971; *Report of The Commission on Obscenity and Pornography*, 1970) arise out of a practical socialization concern, especially since much of at least the cinema audience consists of young persons in a dating relationship. Gagnon & Simon (1973) assume that media influence the climate of sexual attitudes and conduct.

Yorburg (1973) is a recent example of a family life worker who assumes media influence on marriage whether by ideological impact of modernity by which media accelerate social change (p. 1, 10, 15), or by increased information regarding behavioral science insights and techniques filtered through media (p. 127, 128, 155, 200), or by misinformation perpetuated by the media (p. 64, 187), or by the homogenization of culture which diminishes ethnocentrism (p. 140, 162). Most relevant to this investigation is Yorburg's emphasis on the "psychological mobility" which the media provide, "by serving as sources of information about life styles, world views, roles, etiquettes, speech, dress, consumer goods, distant places and distant people. Models proliferate, as do socializing agents" (p. 99). Yorburg assumes that television advertising, for example, allows mutual role learning so that parents may identify with their children to understand better and to cope with the future (p. 133-4). Media provide anticipatory socialization of the norms of middle class life (p. 25), thus the presumed homogenized view of life. On the other hand, media provide such a breadth of role prescriptions that "extravagant vistas promulgated by the mass media and fed by runaway fantasy" (p. 200) need correcting along certain lines. These comments by Yorburg serve to summarize the way in which media influence has been perceived by marriage and family life practitioners. On the one hand, it is seen



positively as a way to teach new and presumably more adequate roles; on the other, it is seen anxiously as the purveyor of half-truths, falsities, or inadequate fantasies. The widespread feeling that marriage does require socialization conceives of it as a set of social tasks and expectations to be learned. The psychological mobility afforded by media is widely seen as influential, especially in providing role models. This assumption that media do have influence, then, is held both by those who are optimistic regarding their potential for improving marriage and family life and those who fear that such social change undermines traditional agents for perpetuating the culture's values. But the widespread practical concern has not found confirmation in empirical research on just what media influence what roles, nor for that matter that media even do influence marital roles. This investigation seeks such evidence.

## RESEARCH

This report of relevant research is presented in two parts. The first sets the parameters of the research reviewed by indicating which research was considered tangential to the investigation, and

which was considered most useful.<sup>8</sup> The first portion actually serves as a rationale for the exploratory character of much of this study and points to some promising lines of investigation. The second part reviews empirical evidence in light of which the stated hypotheses were formulated.

### Parameters of Research

Material deemed only tangentially relevant to the investigation has not been systematically evaluated and summarized. This includes studies focused on socialization from the viewpoint of the child and concerned with basic personality development, child rearing practices, sex-role identity. Material on the parent-child relation, whether in infancy or continued throughout the life cycle, was not systematically studied. Also deemed tangential have been studies which focus on the pre-marital relationship but not from a socialization perspective, for instance, studies on mate-selection, dating, engagement, or pre-marital sexual behavior. Studies covering this pre-marital period, and extending into the marriage itself include studies on role-taking

---

<sup>8</sup> The literature search underlying this investigation has been complicated by factors already indicated (p. 12-13). Underlying this investigation is a thorough literature review of material relating to young adult marriage 1966-1971 (Compaan, 1973). Also, for a previous project the investigator gained a thorough bibliographic acquaintance with all material relating cinema to psychological development, especially focused on the concept of identity (Erikson, 1968), a psychosocial concept which incorporates role concepts within a psychanalytic frame. The diversity of the many fields relevant to this investigation has made a systematic search of the literature difficult. Much tangential research is available; what is of direct relevance is almost non-existent. A specific line of investigation was located within the field of marriage and family literature, and research and practice were related to that proposed line of investigation which was formulated in terms of adult socialization theory in the marriage and family literature.

accuracy and empathy (Stryker, 1956). These, and studies of marital adjustment (of special interest to the study of early marriage are Ryder, 1967, 1971; Rausch, 1970; Rausch, Goodrich & Campbell, 1963) were not examined in detail because of their exclusive focus on the spouse relation. Research on role transitions such as socialization for parental roles (Rossi, 1968; Jacoby, 1969) or for the post-parental status (Deutscher, 1962) was not covered because of the present study's focus on the marital dimension and because the sample couples investigated were in the early years of marriage.

Material which seemed to be more directly relevant included work on parent or marriage education by media. For instance, Brim (1959) noted that there was little evidence to evaluate the contribution of media to a strategy of altering a parent's role performance in child rearing. He cited research evidence from social psychological investigations on persuasion in order to compare the relative influences of media, counseling, and teaching strategies. Also concerned with educating for parenthood, Hereford (1963) cited the limits of media, especially popular magazines with basically informational articles reaching a middle class audience, in educating for parenthood, and performed an experiment which indicated the effectiveness of group discussion techniques of learning. Lowman (1973) found that a packet of information, distributed to couples at the time of application for their marriage license, proved ineffective in a six-month follow-up of the newly married couples.

Some research has focused on the popular media rather than the more formalized attempts to educate through media. Burgess, Locke & Thomes (1971) reported that mass media contain most of the evidence of the romantic version of love which has been largely spurned by

professionals in marriage and family life. Horton (1957) and England (1960) performed content analysis on popular songs and family magazine fiction, respectively, to indicate the love and courtship themes of the media, but did not empirically relate these themes to attitudes and behaviors of the youth supposedly affected by the media images. Donohue (1971) assessed the relative influence of five institutional sources from which high school students derived information leading to sexuality concepts; family, school, church, friends, and other (mass media). He concluded that the family influence was not threatened when a program of sex education was offered in the schools. And though peer groups and media influences challenged the family source, the school program actually decreased influences of the challengers and benefitted the family. The findings of Komarovsky (1964) on conjugal role learning among blue collar marriages provide a good comparison to the data of the present study since many of the socialization agents reported in Chapter 3 (p.190f) were also reported in her investigation. In a 1958-59 sample of blue collar workers, over half of whom had not completed high school and all of whom had at least one child, and some of whom (17 of 58) were recruited through random access to Protestant church rolls, she selected a sample of 46 husbands and wives who had been married less than 7 years and performed content analysis of interview material for any mention of personal or impersonal sources of information on marriage roles. Of the 46, only 9% mentioned books as a source of information, 15% magazines and 4% television, indicating a relatively low reported awareness of information from these media sources, despite a high reported incidence of television viewing. 69% indicated relatives (parents and siblings), with more

mention of those of the same sex; 35% mentioned in-laws, again with more of the same sex; 54% named friends of the same sex; 6% mentioned the "crowd"; and 9% indicated that experts had been a source of information. The results indicated that for the blue collar couples media were clearly subordinate to personal sources of information regarding marital roles.

Thus far the reported evidence for media influence, especially in comparison with family and friends, does not seem to support the strong practical concern that mass media images have significant influence. Media influence on marital roles remains a hypothesis which requires further testing. Many persons have called for further research on media and marital socialization. Kerckhoff (1972, p. 13), discussing the influence of social class on socialization, indicated that there is reason to believe that media have an important influence in the socialization process, but due to a lack of solid empirical evidence regarding this relationship, he chose not to report on media, focusing on family, school, and peer groups instead. Rodgers (1973) not only indicated the need for more studies of adult socialization (p. 112) in research on family interaction and transaction, but also the need to study the relations of the family to the larger social units of the culture (p. 256), the kind of relationships which media represent. The growing concern for studies of adult socialization has already been cited (p. 6). Specifically calling for more research on socialization for marital roles were Sewell (1963), Brim (1968), and Hill & Aldous (1969). The latter included media influence in their exploratory essay which summarized much of the literature relevant to socialization for marriage roles, but they did not cite empirical

evidence of media influence. Brim and Hill & Aldous provided the focus for the line of investigation to which this study contributes. This tradition in the marriage and family literature has been chosen as the theoretical framework for this research because it has clearly identified the problem, has related media influence to fundamental human relations, and, due to lack of a long-standing research tradition, allows some methodological flexibility. But research on marriage and family does not provide such direct evidence of media influence, despite the superiority of the conceptualization of the problem in that field. The hypotheses for this study were stated out of acquaintance with the literature of mass communications research, and it is there that empirical support for the hypotheses is found.

First, these are the limitations of this discussion of the mass communications research. The vast literature on educational media is not reported, but in general one can say that people do learn from media instruction.<sup>9</sup> Also deemed tangential to the present investigation are the many studies of use patterns of which typical examples are Schramm, Lyle & Parker (1961) and Himmelweit, Oppenheim & Vince (1958). These have been fairly broad surveys of the impact which television<sup>10</sup> had on life in general, but with special focus on the children, so that major attention was given to bedtime, study habits, play and recreation habits, relations to friends and family, etc. Some of this material

---

<sup>9</sup> See the excellent review on "Mass Communication and Educational Media," by Lumsdaine and May (1965).

<sup>10</sup> Similar surveys were previously done to test the impact of newspapers, cinema, and radio as each of these new media arrived on the scene.

is of some interest, but I depend heavily on the summary by Weiss (1969) of material relating to the influence of media on the family. The use patterns were primarily designed to describe the audiences reached by the media. Another series of investigations attempted to determine more precise effects of the media on these audiences. Much of this research is limited in usefulness by its focus of attention on crime and delinquency, or the pathology of excessive sex and violence, rather than on everyday roles.<sup>11</sup> The limits of this kind of study are also to be found in the basic conceptualization underlying the research, what has been called the "hypodermic needle" model (Wright, 1959; McQuail, 1969), concerned with a message, and the flow of persuasive information from a source to an isolated individual receiver in the "mass" audience. Even political and economic socialization studies have been more concerned with these media as propaganda and social control, rather than as an agent in the development of the total personality or even of some role relationships that are non-specific to consumption or political decision-making. Such research does not pose the question about what the individual does with the information in his own uniquely individual way. One value of these various research efforts, however, is to demonstrate the inadequacy of this "hypodermic" model. More adequate models have given greater roles to interpersonal influences in media information flow (Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955; Brown, 1962). Klapper (1960) summarized much of the effects of literature and I am heavily dependent upon his review of the literature.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Payne Fund Studies were much concerned about movies as causes of delinquency. Bandura, Berkowitz, Feshbach and Singer have done extensive research on film-mediated models of aggression. *Television and Social Behavior* (1971) summarized much of the type of literature referred to above.

Recent reformulations of the basic questions in communications research provide cause for hope that these traditions shall develop into new lines of investigation which shall eventually inform the problem of marital socialization through media influences. One reformulation is Stephenson's (1967) play theory of mass communications, which stressed the media's positive value to the person and focused on the individual person and what he does with the media. Another promising line of research was opened up by McLeod & O'Keefe's (1972) recent socialization approach to communication. This latter formulation was expressed within a "coorientation" framework which attempts to place the media event as an object of coorientation by a dyad of interrelating persons. Kline (1972) identified symbolic interactionism as part of the conceptual background underlying this coorientation perspective on media communications. Such a framework for research may have potential for future study of media influence on marital socialization since it attempts to view media as part of a transactional event of persons and media, but no research has yet been directed to the problem from this orientation.

To summarize the parameters of available research, marriage and family studies have recognized the need to deal with media influence as part of the process of socialization for marriage. But I know of no research directly attacking the problem. The study of media, though increasingly recognizing the complex interplay of social milieu and media influence, is just beginning to conceptualize communications in relation to the socialization task. What follows, then, is a summary of some of the empirical evidence, mostly from the studies of mass communications, in light of which the hypotheses of this study were formulated.



### Relevant Findings

Although Burgess, Locke & Thomes (1971) cite evidence on the ubiquitousness of the media in American homes, this information does not necessarily support the hypothesis that media influence marital roles. Lacking direct evidence regarding the influence of media on marital roles, I have brought together some of the evidence that media serve as a source of role models. Blumer (1933) was one of a series of investigations known as the Payne Fund Studies. Though the methods available in the 1930's to undertake the study were primitive by today's standards, and the motivation for the studies might seem a bit moralistic to our own time, these studies are still the most substantial record we have of the influence of cinema on adolescent behavior (according to McQuail, 1969). Their emphasis on deviant behavior (the role of the cinema in causing delinquency) makes the details of the investigation of little interest for our study, but these studies do point to the tendency on the part of some youth to use the media images as models for behavior, especially in regard to dating and courtship behaviors. This relationship was affirmed by these studies in spite of the reluctance to assign delinquency-causing influence to the cinema.

A considerable body of literature has developed indicating the role of film- or television-mediated models in inducing aggressive behavior (Berkowitz, et al., 1963; Bandura, et al., 1963; Liebert, 1971). This experimental tradition has been criticized because of the artificial nature of the laboratory findings, and the short-term nature of the effects. Also, the intervening meanings which are crucial to a

total understanding of human behavior are ignored in this tradition in which role learning is reduced to imitation of a stimulus, and is not generally related to the broader understanding of roles to be explicated in the theory section to follow. Nevertheless, the findings of these experimentalists have also been corroborated by field surveys (Lefkowitz, et al., 1971; McLeod, et al., 1971). Though these have all focused on violent, aggressive behavior, there is some indication that media do provide role models for pro-social behavior as well (Stein & Friedrich, 1971). Hyman (1973-74) argued that research is needed which looks at media potential for creating sympathy and social sentiment through identification with victims, as well as its potential for eliciting aggressive responses to an aggressor's example of violence. Research knowledge is limited to a very narrow spectrum of the total role behaviors which might be expected of a normal person in everyday life. Chaffee (1974, p. 110) indicated that there is no evidence available to indicate whether people learn "prototypic patterns of interpersonal communication" from media. And such interpersonal communication patterns are foundational for any understanding of role development. It is generally recognized (*Television and Social Behavior*, 1971) that media models do have at least some effects on some children under some conditions for at least a short-term time period. Specification of the parameters in more detail is needed in order to affirm fully the tradition of study of media effects here cited. But applicable to the broad hypothesis that media influence marital roles, there is empirical support for media's function as role model in at least some instances. This investigation seeks evidence of media as model for marital roles among a select sample of young adult marriages.

In taking account of the media influence one must specify other factors in the communication event. Klapper (1960) summarized much of the literature on the persuasive effects of media by indicating that at best they serve to reinforce what is already present in the person's repertoire of attitudes and role behaviors, although media are more directly influential in formulating opinions on new problems or ideas, for which pre-existing personal attitudes may not exist. It was the formulation of this reinforcement theory that was most influential in the statement of a secondary, qualifying hypothesis alongside the main hypothesis. That media influence marital roles, it is hypothesized, has the qualification that media influence is to be seen in its interaction with parent and peer influences. This second hypothesis also has a firm base in mass communications research. Media influence is to be seen as a complex portion of social interaction. Although many of the earliest studies of mass communications assumed a "hypodermic needle" model in which the media messages were beamed primarily at individual persons in a "mass" audience, isolated, anonymous and out of touch with one another, there is a growing awareness of the way in which social interactions serve to facilitate or to hamper the communication of a particular message. Even the most general audience descriptions reveal that media (except books) are used primarily in social settings. Steiner (1963) discovered that most TV viewing is by household groups, and McLeod (1971) discovered that teenagers in a small town sample rarely watch television alone. Going to the movies is usually a social occasion. Broderick (1966) found for a sample of 16-17 year-olds that 80% of the boys and 93% of the girls preferred to attend movies with cross-sex companions. The use

of media as conversational currency is well documented in Berelson (1949), Mendelsohn (1964), Okabe (1963), Schramm, Lyle & Parker (1961), Schramm, Lyle & Pool (1963), and Troidahl & Costello (1966). Also, Himmelweit, Oppenheim & Vince (1958) indicated that for children, viewers are more socialized and interested in play than non-viewers. On the other hand, some evidence can be cited that some children use media as a withdrawal and escape from the tensions of personal relationships (Emery, 1959; Forsey, 1963). Maccoby (1954) indicated that some children react to frustrating home environments by greater use of television. These divergent findings need not be seen as opposite one another. They do point to the social aspects of television and other media whose use may indicate a highly socialized person or one whose lack of interpersonal skill is bolstered by pseudo-interaction with featured personalities when the normal course of personal relationships is not satisfying (Himmelweit, Oppenheim & Vince, 1958; Horton & Wohl, 1956).

Further evidence of the interaction of media influence with interpersonal influences (notably parents and peers) can be found in studies relating media to interpersonal networks. One relevant research tradition related to the "two-step flow" hypothesis, (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955; Katz, 1957) which posits that media influence opinion leaders who in turn influence others. It is now realized that the model is not merely a simple two steps. Nevertheless, communication researchers acknowledge that interpersonal factors operated in the influence of media. The diffusion of innovation studies (Rogers, 1962) also indicated that media influence is not so powerful as interpersonal factors. Chaffee (1972) indicated that there is a tendency for persons to use media sources whenever merely information is wanted, "news," but

when the person must make a choice, when he must make a decision about a consumer item, he will trust the personal information sources first. Also, he indicated that persons will use media as a means of preparation to speak to persons assumed to be more expert, thus using the media as a "role rehearsal" preparing them for the interaction which will later take place with the presumably more knowledgeable person. Although for some topics, e.g., information regarding state and local news, the media seem to exert some influence on their own, without intervening personal influence (Chaffee, Wood, Tipton, 1970), what evidence there is relating media to learning for marriage seems to indicate that for marital roles personal sources are more influential. The above cited evidence from Lowman indicated that an impersonal packet has no effect, Donohue indicated that a sex education course moderates media influence in favor of family influence, and Komarovskiy indicated that interpersonal sources of information were more important in learning for conjugal roles.

In summary, there is scant research explicitly relating media influence to socialization for marriage, despite the widespread practical assumption that media do influence marital roles. This investigation extends a tradition of study of adult socialization which has been identified in the marriage and family literature, by formulating hypotheses primarily derived from the practical assumptions of marriage and family practitioners, and the research of the mass communications research tradition. Ultimately, however, there is need to develop further research out of an explicit theoretical tradition. The next section elaborates the theoretical stance of a symbolic interactionist approach to adult socialization for marriage roles.

## THEORY

1) Media influence marital roles.

2) They do so in interaction with parent and peer influences.

Both hypotheses can be derived from the concepts and relational propositions of symbolic interactionist theory. Well articulated as a general theory of socialization, widely applied to studies in adult socialization and in marriage and family, the theory is not as well articulated in nor as widely applied to study of mass media influence. The task of this section, then, is to incorporate media influence in a symbolic interactionist theory of adult socialization for marriage. First, the major working concepts of symbolic interactionism will be identified and related to a definition of socialization in general and to the uses and limits of adult socialization in particular. Second, a theory of media influence will be formulated out of these symbolic interactionist concepts which underlie both marriage socialization and media communication. Finally, the theory of media influence in marital socialization will be summarized with reference to the present state of marital socialization theory. The summary theory should not only explain the hypotheses of the investigation, but it should also effectively generalize the research and practice reported thus far, ground communication theory and adult socialization theory in a single set of concepts and relations, and provide propositions from which further hypotheses may be generated to test more specific relationships.

Cooley, Baldwin, Thomas & Znaniecki, Mead, and Dewey have all contributed to the foundations of symbolic interactionist theory. The following presentation of the theory's working concepts draws primarily

on Mead (1934) and contemporary formulations and reviews which appropriate these sources. Rose (1962) presented an early systematic exposition of the framework. Strauss (1964) introduced the work of Mead (1934, 1938) for social psychologists. Stone and Farberman (1970) and Manis and Meltzer (1972) collected and summarized important work from this perspective. Major essays by Blumer (1969), a major contributor to the perspective, have been collected in a single volume. Hill & Hansen (1960), Stryker (1959, 1964) and Schvaneveldt (1970) applied the framework specifically to marriage and family study. Goffman (1974) has used the perspective to describe social interaction and McCall & Simmons (1968) described the perspective as a way of shaping a tradition of research on identities and interactions. The socialization process as conceived by the perspective is well presented in Dager (1964) for child socialization and in Brim (1966, 1968a, 1968b) and Becker (1970) for adult socialization.<sup>12</sup> Sewell (1963), Brim (1968), and Hill & Aldous (1969) all used this framework in calling for further research in socialization for marriage. The most directly relevant account of marital socialization is the exploratory essay of Hill & Aldous (1969). The definitions which guide this investigation were taken from Brim (1966), whose work is basic.

The account which follows begins with a review of Brim's definition of socialization, then presents the basic working concepts of symbolic interactionism with heavy dependence on Mead (1934, 1938), Stryker (1964), McCall & Simmons (1968), and Schvaneveldt (1970). Then,

---

<sup>12</sup> Further major discussions of adult socialization may be found in Sewell (1963), Turk & Wright (1967), and Clausen (1968).

before the next section relates the concepts more specifically to media and marriage, there is a discussion of the uses and limits of adult socialization as an approach to learning marital roles.

### A Symbolic Interactionist Theory of Socialization

As reported above,<sup>13</sup> Brim (1966) defined socialization as

the process by which individuals acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable them to participate as more or less effective members of groups and the society.

The working concepts to be presented here will later be referred back to this basic definition of socialization as a *process*, relating the *behavior of individuals* to the *normative expectations of society*. The components of the definition will organize a summary of the symbolic interaction theory of socialization. The framework will be presented here with no application to media influence on marital socialization, following closely Mead's (1934) original account of the basic concepts.

Contrary to many behaviorist accounts, Mead's *social* behaviorism views the organism as active and not as a merely passive respondent to external stimuli. Thus, many concepts organize themselves around the major concept of *the act*. Mead defined an act as

an impulse that maintains the life-process by the selection of certain sorts of stimuli it needs. Thus the organism creates its environment. The stimulus is the occasion for the expression of the impulse (1934, p. 6).

The basic unit of analysis for the theory is interaction. An impulse seeks adjustment to appropriate objects in its external world. The organism is not merely a passive recipient of stimuli, but is an active, organized impulse which, in adjustment to objects, seeks certain goals,

---

<sup>13</sup> Page 7



the completion of certain acts. Thus, it searches for the stimuli which will fulfill its own line of action. The interaction of organism and its environment is not merely a sequential chain of stimulus-response events. Rather, the interaction is conceived as a total act. The consummation of the act already reaches back and influences the initial phases of the act. The attitude which the organism has toward the environment is the initial stage of the act. It is just as much a part of the act as the observable completion of the act. As an organized response attitude, it guides the selectivity of the organism toward the objects in its environment. The objects are not to be thought of as merely physical "things" in the environment. They become objects by their relation to the act of the organism. They represent a narrower set than the collection of all things present; they are an environment *for the organism*. They become part of the organism's definition of the situation by virtue of the selectivity and response attitude of the organism. Nerve endings for the organism do not merely imitate external objects, or reproduce stimuli. Rather, by organization and selection of just those stimuli which release the act present in its attitude, the responsive organism creates its own environment. The complete act is present in all phases of the act.

In its active involvement with its environment and the objects in it, the organism is related to other organisms which also contribute to the "life-process of the group." Therefore, the act which Mead described must be seen as a *social act*. It involves the cooperation of more than one individual. An organism's attitude may find expression in a *gesture* which serves as stimulus to the response of other organisms. Through the gesture the attitude of the observer is lifted up for

attention so that there can be a mutual orientation of many organisms toward an object in some kind of mutual action in the group. The object defined by the social act is a social object. This gesture as an early phase of the act, actually indicates the later phases of the act and its completion. The gesture is a sign representing the entire action and allowing mutual adjustment of a complex of interacting organisms. The gesture of one calls out a response in another and that response with its gesture in turn stimulates the first again by its gesture. Thus, there is a unity of action among a complex set of interacting organisms. The whole process of communication between organisms may be thought of as a conversation of gestures.

The conversation of gestures may be applied to understand communication of any organism. But in the human, this conversation of gestures becomes self-conscious in *significant gestures* which call out the same responses in oneself as they call out in the other. The verbal gesture is especially important, because by the verbal, spoken word, a person is able to address himself as he addresses another. The self becomes an object for itself. This self-reflexive process allows the individual to incorporate the social organization which is prior to it. Language at once embodies the organized social attitudes which guide the mutual actions of the group and enables the individual to develop as an organized social self through intellectual activity at its most flexible state. In gesture, we had a sign which represented the entire action, but this sign was a signal, closely bound to the immediate expression of the act. In *significant gesture*, rather than

a signal, we have a symbol<sup>14</sup> which represents an entire line of action, and provides greater flexibility and freedom for readjustment. The selection of stimuli, which is characteristic of all organisms, becomes more self-conscious; there is greater control over the organization of the act. When a problem is encountered, for instance, when a line of action seeking expression is blocked, the use of significant symbols allows time for reflection. One can delay response and seek out many possible lines of action. Finally, a plan of action may emerge which adjusts to the stimuli offered and even creates new alternatives through their combination. Language symbols are especially flexible in this act of reflection and readjustment as one addresses oneself with the same vocal gesture with which one addresses others. In taking the role of another, the person sees himself through the eyes and attitudes of others, a viewpoint which Cooley called the "looking-glass self." These attitudes of others serve as an "inner forum" of internalized conversation of significant gestures through which the person addresses himself. These symbolic formulations come to play a large role in the person's own definition of his situation and most especially his own self-definition. Through significant symbol, persons define lines of action toward social objects, thus constructing the social reality out of which they live. According to Thomas, "Situations defined as real are real in their consequences." Social objects do not necessarily exist as physical things, but they do serve as effective organizers of mutual social acts. For instance, the object "stolen base" governs the mutual lines of action of a baseball team.

---

<sup>14</sup> Suzanne Langer's appropriation of sign, signal, symbol, as originally conceived by Morris, has been influential in the above discussion. See *Philosophy in a New Key* (1951), Chapter 3.

This completes the summary of basic working concepts which explain how a person becomes an organized social self, incorporating through interaction with other social selves the organized social attitudes of his group. Further details of the role-taking process will be explained later in specific application to marriage and media. But first the above concepts will be related to the general definition of socialization and to the uses and limits of adult socialization in particular. The major working concepts of symbolic interactionist theory, which Stryker (1959) has characterized as a socialization theory, may be applied explicitly to the major aspects of the definition of socialization which guides this investigation. How does the above account relate to a definition of socialization as a *process*, relating the *behavior* of *individuals* to the *normative expectations* of *society*?

It is important to see *behavior* and *process* together since the symbolic interactionist account sees socialization not as a product, but as a process. And that process involves the social acts of the interacting organisms. It is a behavioral model. Even symbol and thought, which are not often included in a behavioristic account, are related to the act, since attitudes are the first phases of the act, and symbols allow plans of action. Thus, even those non-overt aspects of the act which serve as organizers of behavior are nevertheless important to include in the model of behavior. In Brim's definition of socialization "knowledge, skills and dispositions" are acquired in socialization, for these are all part of the social acts whereby persons become effective participants in groups. Appropriately, it is "effective participation" which is Brim's ultimate measure whether

socialization has occurred.

Further, both *society* and the *individual* have been accounted for and related to one another in the symbolic interactionist model. The society is prior; it is through acquiring the organized social attitudes that the person becomes an organized social self. But the individual is not merely dependent, a product of his environment. Rather, there is freedom to act, to delay response through reflection and readjustment. And the individual appropriates the environment for himself. Thus, through the process of taking the role of another, the self becomes an object to itself, and can self-consciously relate itself to the society. The individual, by its very nature, is constituted by social acts. The self is built up out of social interaction, which is greatly facilitated when that interaction is achieved through significant symbol, allowing many individuals to share the same meanings and thus participate in common actions.

It is this participation in common action which explains the *normative expectations* associated with socialization. In order for there to be mutual cooperation, there must be some predictability of lines of action of other participant organisms. But this predictability is not simply imposed from outside. Rather, it is internalized by the organism which seeks its own share in the action. To fulfill its impulse, the individual must meet the stimulus offered by social objects and common participation in social acts. The social object requires normative expectations, not primarily because the order of things manipulates individuals into massive action, but because if individual lines of action are to find one another and participate in

common action, there must be a mutual orientation and adjustment. That is the nature of normative expectations.

The working concepts may be applied more explicitly to *adult* socialization, as defined by Brim (1966, p. 6):

"Learning new roles and  
as the individual's adaptation to society's demands  
for changes in his social behavior  
as he moved from one position to the next."

With this focus on "role learning," it is not surprising that theoretical support for adult socialization research has come from the symbolic interaction concepts just elaborated. Whether in childhood or adult life, the same process of symbolic interaction constitutes the social self. Some of the significant symbols which serve as social objects defining the person's situation derive from past experiences, from often repeated conversations or gestures which, when internalized as the inner forum, account for a great deal of continuity. These, in fact, are some of the most important social objects deriving from childhood socialization. Other significant symbols may derive from the immediate interactive landscape of present situations. But no new set of concepts is required to extend the usefulness of the "socialization" concept beyond childhood learnings to the generalized case of the relation of any neophyte to any organized social unit,<sup>15</sup> thus accounting for behavior change required by new role positions encountered in adult life.

Since the interacting self is constantly active, and since it initiates acts in relation to social objects which are its symbolic definitions of the situation, each new act has potential for novelty,

---

<sup>15</sup> The phrase is from Stryker, 1964, p. 133.

for defining a new situation, despite massive continuity. Sometimes change is demanded by the self; sometimes, by others. Inadequate socialization may require change in a continued position, or a shift of situations may require change to meet a new role position. Change may be demanded by others and resisted by the self, or the self may demand changes which are resisted by others (Brim, 1968). Changes may be required by the normal maturation process, by change of interpersonal environments due to mobility, or by parental guidance unavailable or inadequate for new role expectations of adulthood (Brim, 1968). Sometimes change is required to adapt to specific institutional settings such as college life, professional training, mental and other hospitals, and prisons (Becker, 1970). Especially pertinent to media influence, sometimes there is pressure for change due to the sheer multiplicity of sources of socialization, often with conflicting demands which need to be mediated.

The very process which allows for novelty, adjustment and change, i.e., the symbolic interaction of the organism with a changing environment, also accounts for the limits of that same process. Symbols may become easy codifications of reality, so that previously acquired definitions of the situation channel the active impulse more and more in line with previous interactive experience. Thus, one must acknowledge the limitations of adult socialization. Both biological givens and previous learnings set real limits on what adult socialization can accomplish (Brim, 1968). Also, the "affective neutrality" of the relation of socializee and socialization agent, characteristic of most adult socialization, means that the major strategy for inducing behavior change will be an appeal to reason and self-interest, and not

the typical parent-child relationship with the high power disparity and high affect which characterize basic motive and value learning. In the adult, there is more freedom to resist socialization through choice of reference groups, ideas and teachers, and through greater resources (financial, status, and political) to oppose socialization agents. Further freedom from current pressure is provided by the adult's wider set of reference figures, non-immediate significant others upon which to draw to counteract sets of values and opinions. These limitations, then, shift the content of adult socialization, in contrast to child socialization, from values and motives to overt behavior, from acquisition of new material to synthesis of the old, from idealism to realism, from generality to specificity, and there is more concern to teach how to mediate conflicting demands (Brim, 1968).

Basic working concepts of a symbolic interactionist theory of socialization have now been identified and related in broad outline to the uses and limits of adult socialization.

#### Media Influence Marital Roles

This perspective may now be applied to conceptualize the way in which media may influence marital socialization. First, marriage and media are each separately related to the conceptual framework, indicating the value of the common symbolic interactionist terminology to clarify both marriage preparation and media communication. Marriage is treated as a social object; media, as a source of definitions of the situation. Then, media influence on marital roles is discussed specifically, with a theory derived largely from Blumer (1935, 1959) to account for the relations which have been indicated from research



and practice. The theory is finally summarized with reference to Hill & Aldous' (1969) account of media influence on marital socialization.

Seeing marriage preparation as a problem of adult socialization allows use of the symbolic interactionist terminology introduced above in order to understand media influence on marital roles. The same concepts which illuminate socialization for marriage also provide reasonable expectation that media influence the process. Thus, symbolic interactionist theory allows the wedding of media and marital roles, which have never been systematically related to common theoretical formulation.

To elaborate marriage in terms of the theory's working concepts, *marriage may be conceived of as itself a social object*. Just as the social object "stolen base" allows participants in a game of baseball to adjust their mutual lines of action toward a common end, the social object "marriage" allows the achievement of certain mutual lines of action toward common ends. Marriage is not an action in which one may engage alone. The very *positions* which constitute a marriage--primarily husband and wife--require that there be at least two persons whose definitions of the situation include one another in the marriage. But these positions are not limited to these primary participants in the social act. Relations to other persons are defined by the exclusiveness of the intimate marital relation, particularly in the way the position governs sexual behavior and fosters companionship. There is a new position in relation to one's parental home and in the potential of becoming parents. Also, certain economic expectations relate the couple to the support system of the community at large. In all these positions it is the participation in certain mutual lines of action

that defines the situation. It is interaction that creates the social object, while the social object facilitates further interaction.

Role position relates a person to a social structure as one participant among others with particular positional relations to them. Some positions are more global, such as gender identity, socio-economic status, family or kinship patterns. Other positions may be more specifically task-oriented, such as the instrumental roles of the marital status listed by Hill and Aldous: "idea man, planner, problem solver, policy maker, decision-maker, scheduler, allocator, and evaluator" (1969, p. 893). Becker, (1970, p. 275-287) preferred to look at positions in terms of more limited, smaller units of situational adjustment. In terms of the marital relationship, the primary marital role position is that of the spouses to one another, usually equalitarian in American middle class marriages, a relationship which Hill and Aldous (1969) indicated is usually simplified by age similarity, but complicated by gender differences, by upbringing in different parental homes, by the expected extreme comprehensiveness of the relation, and by the expected permanence of the dyad's relationship. Wright & Turk (1967) further indicated that the marital relationship, especially in young marriages, is complicated by the expectation that spouses become more or less independent of the parental homes in which they held dependent positions. Burgess, Locke, and Thomes (1971) stressed this independence from parents as an expectation of American "companionate marriage." Thus, the focus on the position of spouse in the marital dyad must be related to other positions which situate the spouses separately and jointly with relation to expectations of previous and current friends, families, and the larger society.

To say that marriage is a social object is not only to indicate the interacting positions that constitute a marriage and situate it with regard to the society; it is also to delineate certain *prescriptions* which govern the actions constituting a marriage. Self-conscious symbolization, or significant gesture, plays an important role in the mutual adjustment of many positions to the expectations constituting the common social object--marriage. Despite their ability to change in meaning, the symbols take on prescriptive power, and define the realities which govern the social interactions. For example, the marriage ring, once a dowry indicating the transfer of ownership of the bride from father to husband, still symbolizes a sense of belonging in an exclusive, intimate relation, despite the decline in the notion that the bride is a property. As bride and groom take on the new role status, "married person", they bring to their interaction certain expectations expressed in symbolic form which have been part of their previous preparation for marriage. When the symbols, for instance, a marriage ring, mean the same for both spouses, then mutual interaction is facilitated. But when the symbols evoke different definitions of the situation, then there is need to work out the mutual definitions of the participants so that their prescriptions for one another are realistic and mutual. This is one reason why marriages of persons with similar social and religious background are more likely to succeed. More common definitions of the situation facilitate mutual adjustment and taking the role of the other. One interaction which is highly laden with symbolic and prescriptive value is the act of sexual intercourse. Long associated primarily with the commitment of a marriage relationship, it is subject to new definitions, but not without struggle as

participants who deviate from this norm adjust their expectations to one another and to society. Preparation for marriage involves not only acquiring the symbolic meanings which govern the interaction of marriage but the skills in adjusting these meanings to the uniquenesses of the participants' acquired symbolic definitions.

The role prescriptions may be thought of as the behaviors and attitudes deemed appropriate to the positions of marriage. These expectations have also been termed "role scripts" (Gagnon & Simon, 1973), indicating allowable behaviors and attitudes for occupants of given positions in given situations. But not all situations or positions are well specified. Thus, McCall & Simmons (1966) distinguished between *social* roles, the parameters of societal expectations which may not be firmly fixed, and *interactive* roles, the way in which particular individuals carry out interactions required of a given setting given their own identities. There is evidence (cited by Compaan, 1973, p. 110f; also affirmed by Hill & Aldous, 1969) that marital roles are increasingly more open than closed. Thus, one would expect greater emphasis on the interactive and less on the social roles.

Both the normative expectations of the social roles, and the flexibility allowing for uniquely individual ways of acting out the interactive roles are accounted for in the symbolic interactionist account of socialization as role learning. Socialization has been described above as a process of role-taking, that is, of becoming a self through building up one's unique self-concept through the social perceptions acquired from other interacting persons. The self becomes a social object to which one responds as others respond. The perceptions of others become self-conceptions in the form of "me"

expectations. As a baby, one first relates to the world from a totally egocentric view. All other persons, "they," must relate to "me." But through role-taking the person gradually evolves a sense of its own selfhood, becoming an "I" who relates to "them." Interpersonal perceptions are internalized as dialogue of the self with others, represented for the self as the "me" which has been acquired through taking the perceptions of those others about me. This "me," the normative expectations of the society, is comprised of role expectations which grow out of the interpersonal positions which the self occupies. Many persons responding to similar stimuli, to similar persons, participate in a common social matrix of "me" expectations. Thus, there is continuity of expectations in the social structure when others relate to "me" as "married" or "not married."

Although this "me" is largely built of social role expectations, it also allows for the interactive roles, since each individual "me" has experienced a unique combination of persons and groups and thus its own self-perception is unique. A basic concept more useful in explicating the interactive roles is the "I." The "I" acts as the spontaneous, creative impulse which is the self *qua* actor. The "me" is the self *qua* audience, evaluating the actions of the self through the expectations organized in the "me." And the way one actually carries out his role is the self *qua* character, the phenomenal self (McCall & Simmons, 1966). Both the creative and the censoring, the novelty of the impulsive self and the expectations of others, are assumed to be operative and important. The "I" makes unique plans for action and carries them out. But the action must always be seen in light of the situation in which the act is carried out, in a social setting which precedes the acting "I."

The concepts of symbolic interaction may now be applied to understanding media's influence. When marriage is conceived as itself a social object, *media may be seen as at least one important source of symbolic definitions of the situation.* It is one way in which the positions and prescriptions of marriage are lifted up for attention in the conversation of gestures. Media provide role learning which is not unlike any other role learning. Organized social attitudes are lifted up and given expression as significant symbols (audio, visual and lingual). Gestures are portrayed which indicate the completion of prescribed acts of marriage. While there is not the completed act which is possible in "live" interpersonal interaction, the media's vicarious models do provide possible lines of action to be reflected upon as mental play, alternatives to be explored in fantasy. The play of "me" expectations in one's "inner forum" pits various expectations against one another. Alternative lines of action are explored in the images--both real and fantastic--of media. It remains, however, for the action itself to provide knowledge of consequences *for me.* Thus, self-definition, though it may be explored through "play" with media images, must ultimately be achieved through the interaction of self with others in live interaction. Beyond play, the self acquires the complex rules of the "game" through being able to anticipate the roles of many others. In marriage, for instance, parents, spouses, peers, children, legal authorities, and employers all participate in the social object because they know sufficiently the expectations which will be met by the others with respect to the marriage. This set of "rules of the game" is the "generalized other" that provides a definition of the social reality by which one perceives

that people in general govern their lives. The media, especially suited to communicate what "people in general" are like, thus play a role as "generalized other" in defining the social roles which inform the achievement of the more individualized interactive roles.

In common with all symbolic interaction, media symbols are gestures which anticipate the completion of acts. Persons who are exposed to the media symbol, however, adjust their own response to the gesture, thus acting toward the "social object" from the perspective of their own "constructed" environment. When there is congruence between the gesture portrayed in the medium and the completed act of the viewer, then there is significant symbol, and the viewer's own self has become a social object built up in part through interaction with the media symbol.

But the interaction allowable with media is limited. Only portions of the act are abstracted, thus there may not be a complete picture of the role expectations which comprise a given social object, such as marriage. For instance, media marriage images abound for the "romance" of marriage and the role of "lover," and also for the role of "consumer" relating that marriage to the economic system. But there is little guidance for the "management" of marriage, the role of "budgeter." Further, the pseudo-interaction which people have with media personalities is transcended by the reality of interpersonal experience. When real options are limited, the role of the limited media interaction in defining social reality may be larger, but the adequacy of the media roles for the individual must be tested in the person's own field of significant others. Media images are indeed vivid, but they are not concrete to the person's situation. They are

achieved through complex technologies in distant production facilities and marketed for mass consumption. While for a group, media symbols become part of the fabric of social interaction and thus contribute to completed acts of the group, there is a real limit to the interaction and completion of acts of individuals. Since attention is controlled by the recipient organism, it is difficult to provide new input via the media. Rather than creating new meanings, media draw out or evoke meanings that are already there in the person's set of "me" expectations. That is why Klapper's emphasis on reinforcement is so persuasive in response to short-term experimentally-induced aggression and why violent media-presented models must be related to the larger question of the real-life conditions under which such violent behavior results. Definitions of the situation are themselves important variables to be dealt with in evaluating the influence of any media models. The circumstances which comprise the social reality out of which the person acts must be delineated. Therefore, in any prediction of the effects of media models on marital roles, there must be some account of significant others. The organized social attitudes of the parents will have major impact in providing the "me" expectations out of which role conduct is formed. The child comes to media already with this organized set of social learnings from home. And the import of peers must also be taken into account as the person refers his behavior to the "me" which is comprised of their perceptions of him.

The *mass* media, then, tend to provide the more stereotypic social role expectations since they cannot provide the interactive role which each couple arrives at through their own unique interaction. Such a limitation on the role which media play in the socialization



process is not surprising, since for adult socialization in general there was not so much impact on the basic values achieved through interaction with parents in early childhood.

Now, before a symbolic interactionist account may specifically relate media influence and marital roles, what relations reported in the practice and research sections above must be accounted for to understand media influence on marital roles? How well does the scheme thus far presented fit what is already known from practice and research?

We have seen that *media do socialize by providing role models*. While no explicit evidence supports the practical concern that media input undermines home and church and school training, nevertheless, such must be held as a possibility. There is research evidence that people do learn from media, and media do provide role models. Thus media input further complicates the proliferation of role models and agents to supplement and/or compete with parents and the agents they sanction.

*Media socialization may broaden or limit one's effective experience of social reality*. There was concern and some evidence that media have potential to provide wider horizons, lures beyond present experience, which accelerate social change. But there was also evidence to indicate that media influence is limited, providing no feedback for reality testing and providing experiences which are less than adequate to reality. Especially in the *mass* media is there a narrowed spectrum of human experience (Tannenbaum and Greenberg, 1968). Both extremes can be explained in symbolic interactionist terms, since there is a certain flexibility allowed in play with images from outside one's own immediate experience. But the "rules" of the generalized

other mean that media images are also constricted and stereotypic, allowing little of the uniqueness which is expected in the open give-and-take interaction with many unique individuals through which interactive roles are achieved.

Finally, *media socialization is moderated or enhanced by interpersonal socialization agents*. High media use per se does not preclude interpersonal facility. In fact, both the extremely gregarious and the extremely isolated are heavy media users. But there was considerable evidence that media influence is moderated by interpersonal (parent or peer) influences. Experiences with parents and peers were far more influential in preparation for marriage than any medium. Media seem to have most influence if persons have little previous experience or opinion on the matter at hand. But when decision and commitment are required, then these are elicited more by the people we know than by knowledge gained through the media. The "diffusion of innovation" studies indicated that changes which one hopes to induce through the media are more likely when interpersonal support is provided for the media communication.

It is crucial to see that in the symbolic interaction account media influence is integral to the socialization process because symbolic behavior of interacting organisms is primary and constitutive. It is not a matter of merely one stimulus that provokes a response, nor a channel to carry hopefully persuasive information. Rather, symbolic interaction constitutes the very socialization process itself, whether through the reference groups of face-to-face interaction or through the reference models of media. There may be different degrees of power in the influence of media and face-to-face models,

but the description of the process remains the same. To summarize, marriage has been described as a social object built up through symbolic interaction. Media, it has been argued, is one means of defining this social object, although it has more effect in the stereotypic social roles and is always uniquely appropriated in the interactive roles of each marital pair. Now media influence on marital roles may be discussed explicitly from a symbolic interaction perspective which takes into account the research findings summarized above.

Mead (1934) laid the foundations for a socialization account which would include the communications media which have played an expanding role in socialization since Mead's time. He saw media of communication such as journalism, drama, and the novel as facilitators of role-taking. The media "report situations through which one can enter into the attitudes and experience of other persons" (p. 257). He associated the enjoyment of romance, motion pictures and art with the novelty of the "I," the "possibilities of the self which lie beyond our own immediate presentation" (p. 204). Although Mead did not himself elaborate much beyond these explicit references to media's role in socialization, his insight into the media's potential for enhancing the possibilities of the self by enabling entry into another's experience will be increasingly useful. Efforts to overcome the limits of communication theory which is dominated by the information flow, "hypodermic needle" model will benefit from the contribution made by Mead's total scheme of insights. Hugh Duncan (1962, 1968) has written a great deal about mass communications media from a symbolic interaction perspective, but he does not build scientific theory with

the intent of deriving verifiable propositions. The coorientation perspective of Newcomb (1953) draws on symbolic interactionist insight and Stephenson's *Play Theory of Mass Communication* (1967), stressing convergent selectivity, while not derived from Mead, is nevertheless a trend in theory which is stimulated and encouraged by Mead's approach.

The formulation of symbolic interaction theory of mass communication influence which follows has been drawn from Blumer (1935, 1959). Although Blumer did not explicitly state theoretical propositions regarding media effects, such can be derived through reflection on this symbolic interactionist's comments on media. Blumer's insights regarding media effects will fit into an account of marital socialization from an adult socialization perspective framed in symbolic interactionist terms.

Despite his symbolic interaction perspective, Blumer's (1933) work on movies' effect on conduct was caught in the dominant hypodermic needle approach to communications. This was reflected in his concept of "the mass" in an article (1935) on "Moulding of Mass Behavior through the Motion Picture." He defined "mass behavior" as ". . . aggregate activity occurring on the outside of society and culture but containing in itself the forces and possibilities of a new social order. . . ." (1935, p. 122). Thus, he conceived of the movie audience as having these attributes of the "mass." The audience consists of individuals with heterogeneous backgrounds. Thus, there is no form or organization, no program, nor rules, nor tradition, nor culture. There is no group-consciousness, nor we-feelings, nor bonds of loyalty. The individuals remain anonymous, without social position and without designated functions. In this view, then, the motion pictures were especially

effective in "moulding" mass behavior through "emotional possession" of individuals who were cut off from the organized social attitudes of family, neighborhood, school, and church. The motion pictures were conceived by Blumer as having undue influence because of their vividness, their intimate "close-ups," and their dramatic character, all of which make for ease of identification with the movie characters, thus, of role-taking. The spectator is absorbed in "having the experience." This attitude was summarized by Blumer in this way:

Where the objects of concern are presented vividly and distinctly, where they are brought into intimate and close touch with the spectator, and where they share the impelling movement of drama, they arrest attention, check intrusion, and acquire control. The individual loses himself in the pictures.

To induce this absorption or identification on the part of the spectator is the avowed purpose of the producer; to have the experience is the desire of the average movie-goer (p. 123).

Blumer's concern for cinema's influence was framed in terms of the absence of society and defined culture, a threat to the traditions and prescribed roles and rules of the local "folk" culture. But he failed to see that the "invading" cinema was itself organized, and an expression of cultural patterns, despite its conflict with certain local mores. Thus, Blumer stressed only one aspect of what even he recognized as a dual role of cinema. Though it may have detached the viewer from local culture and turned the viewer's attention to an outside world, the movie nevertheless contained within itself the "forces and possibilities of a new social order." Thus, though the individuals in the movie audience may have been part of an "aggregate," there was nevertheless an ordered cultural pattern with organized social positions and functions which found expression in the cinema. One valuable insight from Blumer's 1935 account was the realization that cinema, because of its universal appeal to primary emotions,

sentiments and passions reaffirmed basic human values,<sup>16</sup> though its effect on local culture may be the undermining of mores. Blumer did not feel that movies expressed culture, i.e., an intervening scheme of interpretation, a guiding ideal or a consistent scheme of life. Yet, he saw them as the "penetration of basic human values into new social forms." Movies provided an attack on local culture; they established stereotypes, a new culture. He saw the appeal of movies to the basic appetites and impulses, thus allowing reveries, the play of inner experience free from the sanctions imposed on external behavior. Because of the hypodermic needle, which viewed media in terms of the messages they communicated rather than the experiences (even internalized symbolic experiences) they elicited, Blumer failed to give adequate emphasis to his own insight. He came close to Stephenson's play theory of mass communication with its stress on convergent selectivity when he indicated that individual movie goers exercised a certain backward control over motion pictures at the box office by their acts of selection. He saw the movies, then, as "unconscious experiments in feeling out the developing tastes and aspirations of the people and helping to mould them into a consistent pattern of life" (p. 127).

In light of Blumer's early account both the "me" expectations with their well-defined roles and rules, and the "I" which seeks out novel expression of the organism's impulses, are important in an account of media. Symbolic play, whether using verbal, literary, musical, visual, or even interpersonal symbols, provides unconscious

---

<sup>16</sup> Of course, what one considers to be "basic human values" is itself subject to cultural definition.

experiment toward a consistent life pattern. And this "play" of symbolic interaction provides a means of arriving at the organized social attitudes which constitute social objects, whether for the individual self as social object, or for the institution of marriage as social object. And so, for both the individual fantasy triggered by media experience and the societal symbols expressed in the media images, there is a possibility that what is interpreted as a period of *cultural disintegration* is actually preparation for a *new order* of life.

Blumer's later (1959) critique of media research developed his previous insights beyond the notion of "mass" with its undue attention to effects on the individual. He criticized the dominant communications research model which treated a media source of influence as independent variable and certain quantified responses as dependent effects and the audience as a sample to be demographically described. Blumer gave the audience much more importance as a factor in the variability of response. He argued that the audience be treated, not as merely responding to stimuli, but as forging definitions inside their own experience. Such a view means that any communication channel must be seen as part of a whole process in which numerous variables are intertwined, interacting and transforming. The individual respondent was no longer seen as an isolated target of a message that was alien to local culture, but as one who participates in a whole network of relations in a developing process which controls the *initial reception* of the media input by the viewer's *attention*, but also controls the *interpretation* of the media event by the viewer's *reference groups*. There is need to look at both time relations and contextual relations to know how the individual selects the gesture lifted to attention, forms objects,

determines their significance, and integrates them into the total context of thinking/feeling/acting.

In summary, what is Blumer's contribution to a symbolic interactionist theory of media influence on socialization? There is a real interaction of the organism's impulse and the media gesture which releases the act. Through the organized social attitude present in a person's "me" expectations, he already exercises some control over the act which is elicited by the media gesture. This "me" is, of course, subject to the prior social organized attitudes of the reference groups in which the individual participates. Both continuity and novelty are allowed. There is an organized social attitude expressed in the medium that affirms basic human values, though these basics which find expression as "generalized other" are themselves subject to shifting social definitions. But because it comes from outside the local experience, there is a real possibility of novelty, and media may undermine local mores and create new social orders. Movies are not necessarily more powerful because of their vividness and sharp definitions. While such vividness no doubt promotes identification and role taking on fundamental, common human experience, it nevertheless may inhibit identification when the basic values are not communicated and only the dated customs, styles and mores remain.

Using Blumer to make Mead's account more directly applicable to media influence, the above account has made plausible the relations discovered in research. *Media do socialize by providing role models.* Media provide gestures signifying the completion of certain lines of action. They give expression to organized social attitudes. There is no reason to indicate any different basic process for socialization in



the play of media images than in the play of "me" expectations which are internalized as significant symbol through one's interactive experience of other persons.

*Media socialization may broaden or limit one's effective experience of social reality.* One cannot say that media per se threaten to undermine mores inculcated by church, school, or home, nor that media effectively broaden the limitations of these local agencies in a positive sense. The potential for each is present theoretically. The threat to local custom is possible because the media enhance the symbolic play which is so typically human in the delay of immediate response for reflection on alternatives. The vivid concreteness of media images provides a feeling of immediacy to alternative experiencing, making possible a wider range of roles than may be present in some social worlds. But, especially in *mass* media, the options are a relatively narrow spectrum of the range of available roles, and only the most typical dimensions of those roles may be presented. There is not as much room for unique elaboration of roles as in the give and take of interpersonal experience across a range of social settings.

*Media socialization is moderated or enhanced by interpersonal socialization agents.* Media may express the social attitudes which organize large segments of social interaction. But even this "generalized other" of a whole society is interpreted by reference to the sub-groups in which one participates, beginning with the family. The first expectations are achieved through interaction with the significant others of the home and immediately surrounding interpersonal environment. These local contributors to the "inner forum"

of "me" expectations, by virtue of their greater affective power over the person, become powerful factors in reinforcing or inhibiting the alternatives offered in the media. They provide the definitions which are internalized by the individual and thus control attention to and interpretation of media gestures.

Now the foundations for a symbolic interactionist theory have been presented. This may be used to round out the existing theory relating media influence to marital socialization. Although Sewell (1963), Brim (1968), Hill & Aldous (1969) and Rodgers (1973) have specifically called for the study of preparation for marriage as a problem of adult socialization, only Hill & Aldous (1969) specifically related media influence to that process of marital socialization. The present discussion is an expansion of the perspective offered by Hill & Aldous in their exploratory essay.

The hypothesized media influence on marital role learning was seen by Hill & Aldous (1969) as an important supplement to the limitations of parental role models. The parental family does contribute basic motivation to marry (especially for boys), gender orientation, and major value orientations. Also, there is a tendency for children with happily married parents to be happily married as well, and for unhappy marriages to be transmitted. But Hill & Aldous anticipated severe limitations on the parental home as an agent of socialization for marital roles. The child has no occasion to participate in the interacting marital dyad, but participates chiefly in the parent-child, or the sibling subsystems instead. The child has not experienced the marital role, but has been a recipient of the parent-child role. For five reasons Hill & Aldous feel that ". . . young adults are more

definite about their own preferences with respect to parental than with respect to marital roles" (p. 894). First, the powerful-parent and powerless-child interaction has more impact on the child who experiences the ego-alter situation in those terms. Second, there is more intentionality of parental sanctions on the child. Third, the parent-child interaction occurs earlier, much at the preverbal stages and is therefore unconscious. Fourth, the parent-child system cannot be masked as the marital often is. Fifth, there are often role rehearsal opportunities for older children to act as "parent" to younger siblings. The limitations of parental models for marital roles are further heightened by the new emphasis on the *marital* role dimension per se, and the shift toward a less restrictive role definition to more interactive roles. In light of these limits of the parental family, Hill & Aldous see a value in the corrective observation of marriages of others as a way to expand the repertoire of role behaviors. Media are seen as an important means of providing the enlarged repertoire of role models which is lacking in the home of reference. This notion is akin to the previously indicated idea (Burgess, Locke, Thomes, 1971) of media's value in providing psychic mobility or Blumer's early emphasis on the movies as coming from *outside* the local culture.

But media alone do not provide adequate models. The limits of media influence are similar to the previously indicated limits of adult socialization. As Brim (1968, p. 193) pointed out, "Mass media research shows that adults routinely select confirming evidence from the mass media to substantiate their existing attitudes and beliefs."

Clausen's (1968) description of the significant features of adult socialization lead us to expect that the spouse will be the chief

socialization agent, a further limit to media influence. In adult socialization there is a building up of mutual expectations which become normative for the participants. But cultural and subcultural definitions provide only partial guidance, for each relation has its unique as well as its typical aspects. There is a heavy involvement in the orientations of coparticipants. In peer relations, such as dating, friendship, or living together before marriage, some spouse-like roles may be rehearsed. Especially in adolescence, peer groups provide a means of relating to others outside the family of orientation. Dating and friendships provide opportunity to rehearse interpersonal skills and role-taking accuracy. Broderick (1966) stressed the importance of peers in the courtship process, as a support for the transition from the parental home to a new family. What role do media play in this interactive process of mutual definition and action? Media provide one important source of definitions and offer alternative lines of action, the parameters and options within which the interacting couple defines and acts.

Now, media influence on marital role learning may be summarized. Why would one expect media to have influence? Because marriage is itself a social object, built up through symbolic interaction, and media provide one important source of symbols which govern the mutual lines of action constituting that social object. But media influence must be seen in its relation to parental influences, which by the nature of the earliest parent-child interactions, provide fundamental value orientations for the individual. Media influence must also be related to peers which provide significant opportunity for quasi-marital role rehearsal. Media provide the typical social roles, a symbolic

landscape in the context of which the unique interactive roles of marriage are determined. They provide the "generalized other" which defines the larger parameters, the "rules of the game" within which real interactions are played. They provide psychic mobility, that is, the play of images and role models which provide a wider set of role models and thus supplement a given situation. They supplement parental role models, and they provide the social currency of peer interaction. But media role models are themselves limited. They do not provide the feedback of action consequences which real participation provides, and they abstract only portions of the acts.

The research and practice relating to media influence on marital roles have been summarized. These findings and expectations have been grounded in a single set of concepts derived from a symbolic interactionist approach to adult socialization. Only broad expectations have been indicated. Theoretical predictions for specific media influence on specific role positions and prescriptions have not been attempted. Exploration of the data in hand will facilitate such specification at a later time. The operational model which follows indicates specific role positions and expectations which shall be used to conduct that exploration and to test the hypotheses:

- 1) Media influence marital roles.
- 2) Media do so in interaction with parents and peers.

#### SUMMARY OF THE OPERATIONAL MODEL

For the purposes of this investigation, role *positions* and *prescriptions* are derived from specific questionnaire item responses in the data base which will be further described in Chapter 3. A global survey of young adult marriages provided information regarding

six different role dimensions: sexual, marital, companionate, parental, leisure, and economic. For each of these dimensions the role position which dominates is that of the spouses to one another, largely in terms of an egalitarian relationship. Also, it must be remembered that these are young adults, with respect to their position in the life cycle.

There is little emphasis on positional expectations focused on a male or a female role per se. Thus, certain role prescriptions are excluded, for example, the relationship often found in low-income couples in which the wife is more interested in expressive and the husband in instrumental values (Hill and Aldous, 1969, p. 901), and expectations regarding power for decision-making. Each of the role dimensions is briefly described below in terms of position and prescriptions or expectations for that role dimension. These will be identified in Chapter 3 in terms of specific survey questionnaire items, and form the major content for the model confirming the investigation's hypotheses in Chapter 5.

### Sexual Roles

The role position of the sexual dimension focuses entirely on the spouse relationship, and that solely with an intra-marital focus. There is no reference in the variables of this investigation to sexual behavior outside the marital relationship. Prescriptions included are: that sex is itself a means of communication between spouses which may be openly communicated about, that the sexual relationship is enjoyable and valuable, that the sexual relationship is to be worked at in order to improve it, that sex is to be valued as play, that sexual intercourse is a sacred act and/or is for the purposes of procreation.

### Marital Roles

The variables in the marital dimension focus primarily on the position of the spouses in relation to one another, but with some reference for each spouse to their own personal selfhood and with reference for the couple to the sanctions of the social milieu. No reference is made to a spousal role position in relation to group marriage or any other non-monogamous relationship. The expectations for the marital roles as represented in this study are these: that marriage is a life-long commitment of two individuals, that marriage may take a variety of forms, that some legal or other social sanction is required, and that it should be personally fulfilling for each spouse.

### Companionate Roles

These variables focus on the position of the spouses in relation to one another with an implied exclusivity, so that the degree of intimacy of the marital relationship is not widely shared. There are two general expectations: that the spouse will be a companion whose company is enjoyed, and that there will be a great deal of communication between spouses, including not only general communication, but also focus on quality of the spousal relationship itself, and sharing of intimate personal matters.

### Parental Roles

This dimension examines the influence of parenthood on the spouse relationship. The position of spouses with reference to one another is complicated by the position of parent with reference to

child. The new status also positions the marital pair with reference to a wider society with expectations about child rearing practices and family size. No variables in this study focus explicitly on the parent-child interaction. Rather, the variables represent the attitudes of the spouse and prospective (or actual) parent toward the roles "marriage partner" and "parent." The expectations might be expressed as follows: That the parental role is subordinate to the marital role, that children will be freely chosen, that family size will be regulated, and that children will be properly raised and adequately supported.

#### Leisure Roles

The leisure dimension focuses on what spouses do with their discretionary time. Position may vary, depending on how one chooses to use time--to relate to one's own needs in self-expression, or to one's spouse and friends in companionship, or to the society in commercial entertainment. The following expectations encompass the role dimension variables of this study: that leisure activity should provide opportunity for social companionship, that leisure should provide opportunity for self-expression, that leisure activity be more self-generated than commercial, and that leisure should provide new and different experiences.

#### Economic Roles

The role dimension represented by the economic variables in this study is not primarily socioeconomic status as commonly



applied.<sup>17</sup> Role positions focus instead on the way in which economic factors, such as career orientation and consumption of economic goods, affect the marital relation or lifestyle. There is some focus on the effect of gender identity on the relation to what roles each should play in the economic support of the family. This role also indicates some position of the spouses in relation to a wider economic sphere in society and the activity of each spouse relative to that sphere as over against the more private sphere of the home. Career is not the only aspect in which the position of the spouses must be defined relative to the larger economic sphere. Consumption of goods also relates in part to social expectations. Mobility and the motivations for career deal with the position of the individual spouse in relation to his or her own personal needs. The expectations described include: that the husband is the primary breadwinner with the wife as a supportive person at home, that basic economic necessities will be provided and that one's material goods will increase, that economic considerations outweigh other factors in choice of a job, that mobility is to be expected in career and lifestyle.

The above roles represent the dimensions which will be used to test the broadly stated hypotheses of this investigation. The state of research does not allow specific effects on the above specified roles to be spelled out. Theoretical support has been provided primarily for the broad hypothesis of media influence on marital roles, and that in relation to parents and peers. Because the advance of scientific research and theory cannot be separated from the advance of heuristic

---

<sup>17</sup> Kerckhoff (1972) holds that socio-economic status is an important determinant of other socialization dimensions.

technique, it is imperative that the procedures of investigation be suited to the problem and its context. Therefore, the next chapter states a methodological perspective which is especially suited to this investigation, which arises out of practical concern and for which there is little research data. The perspective is in harmony with the symbolic interactionist theoretical stance, and it provides the rationale for the procedures spelled out in Chapter 3. Further, the philosophical and theological assumptions underlying the investigation are made explicit as values which have shaped not only the method, but also the choice of problem and its perspective.

## Chapter 2

## PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE INVESTIGATION

That a social scientist should acknowledge the doctrine of God and the anthropology implicit in an empirical investigation or that a theologian should use the discipline of scientific method to advance theological inquiry has not been self-evident for either discipline. Yet practical theologians, especially those in religious education or pastoral counseling, aim at both. Moore (1970, p. 14) has proposed "that ministry become both more scientific and more theological." The present discussion makes explicit the way in which one religious educator's theological assumptions have informed the conduct of this particular empirical investigation at all levels--problem, theory, and method. It also lifts up the present study as a paradigm which demonstrates the way in which empirical investigation may further theological inquiry.

To clarify the assumptions implicit in stating and investigating the problem is crucial, not only because of the way in which the symbolic interactionist perspective is so attentive to the role of symbolic definitions of the human situation, but also because the problem of media influence on marital roles has only recently emerged in a study discipline which itself is relatively new. This greater ambiguity of the problem area allows more room for the investigator's own assumptions to play a creative role in the process of inquiry.

But not only has the investigator's theological vision of reality entered into the empirical inquiry; the empirical study is itself a contribution to the theological task. Theology has been broadly defined

as "any coherent statement about matters of ultimate concern that recognizes that the perspective by which it is governed is received from a community of faith" (Cobb, 1965, p. 252). In the spirit of this definition, then, this chapter places the entire investigation in theological perspective. The aim at disciplined, coherent thought is inherent in the scientific enterprise.

The search for adequate empirical methodology is of concern for many reasons. First, the dominant scientific worldview has raised serious questions about "God," the central term of faith statements. Also, much experience has been virtually excluded from scientific investigation because rigorously controlled experimental paradigms could not manage its complexity. Further, epistemology is a fundamental issue; for many, the only truth is that which is verified by methods available to science. The choice of problem to be explored is also a matter of ultimate concern. Imaging social reality, once the preserve of institutions governed by a wholistic vision critically accountable to theological reflection, is lodged more and more in institutions with more specialized tasks (e.g., media entertainment and business advertising). Further, unity of vision cannot be assumed, and radical pluralism forces decisions about conflicting values. For instance, marriage, long construed by the church as instituted by God, is a matter of ultimate concern and therefore, so is the role which media may play in defining it.

This chapter makes explicit the way these concerns are focused by indebtedness to the perspective of the Christian community.<sup>1</sup> My

---

<sup>1</sup> The intention is to state a broadly Christian tradition, although my experience as a clergyman in the United Methodist Church indicates a major governing perspective.

value assumptions, which arise from the Christian vision of reality, are consciously related to the investigation. Though not always explicitly acknowledged as Christian, these values have shaped the way the problem is focused, the theoretical framework deemed useful, the selected methods, and the interpretation of findings.

The United Methodist Church considers four sources valid for the theological task: the Bible, church tradition, reason, and experience (*The Discipline* 1972, para. 70). Thus, an empirical investigation which orders experience through rational observation and generalization has its place as one element in theological inquiry. While this chapter indicates the way in which the entire investigation contributes to the theological task, scientific inquiry must not be taken as a self-sufficient method of doing theology. This study concentrates on mastering the empirical discipline of investigation in a manner which makes possible its appropriation for the theological task.

This chapter is informed by a general understanding which has been articulated within the emerging tradition of process theology. The philosophical work of Alfred North Whitehead<sup>2</sup> is foundational. He set out a speculative metaphysics which takes account of intellectual reformulations resulting from relativity theory in the physical sciences. Thus, the Newtonian cosmology, highly explanatory as it was, was ultimately revealed as inadequate. Complex distinctions within process thought are not attempted. Rather, a general statement of the insights of process theology summarizes the way in which the Christian vision

---

<sup>2</sup> Principle works consulted include *Science and the Modern World*, 1925; *Process and Reality*, 1929; *Adventures of Ideas*, 1933; and *Modes of Thought*, 1938. Hereinafter, these are documented as SMW, PR, AI, and MT, respectively.

concerning God and man informs the conduct of scientific inquiry. What is presented is not an exhaustive survey of the insights of process thought into the nature of scientific inquiry. Rather, the chapter, indeed, the entire investigation, provides an agenda for further inquiry. Process thought was primarily appropriated from Whitehead himself (SMW, PR, AI, MT), with specific theological application greatly dependent on John B. Cobb, Jr. (1965, 1967, 1969, 1975). Also helpful were Griffin's (1973) discussion of Christology, readings collected by Meland (1969), and Brown, James, and Reeves (1971), and the overview of process theology provided by Pittenger (1969).

First, it is argued that empirical investigation contributes to the theological task. To advance this argument, basic conceptions of scientific research, God, and human responsibility are clarified by Whitehead's critique and revision of the scientific worldview. The research act of symbolic transformation is seen as analogous to God's act of creative transformation. Thus, the conduct of science may be seen as a means of identifying God's aims toward harmony and intensity for the world, and of enhancing those aims.

Second, the theological vision which underlies the study is made explicit. Values arising out of the Christian vision of reality are related to all phases of the study--problem statement, theory formulation, and research methodology.

Finally, a style of research consistent with the above values is documented. In the spirit of symbolic interactionist theory, exploratory/confirmatory data analysis is presented as the method for this study and as a paradigm fostering an imaginative empiricism in the discipline of religious education where scientific and theological inquiry might increasingly inform one another.

## EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION CONTRIBUTES TO THE THEOLOGICAL TASK

In order to inquire whether empirical investigation may indeed contribute to the theological task, the conception of human science and of God must be clarified. Central features of both scientific method and of the role of God in relation to it are explained in relation to the scientific worldview which was ultimately debilitating both for scientific and theological inquiry. Whitehead, in his speculative metaphysics, exposed the weaknesses of the scientific worldview accompanying the Newtonian cosmology, and presented a cosmology which renews the vision of both the theological and the scientific task. Whitehead's cosmology enables new understanding of God and of the scientific method, providing grounds for describing the way in which empirical inquiry may contribute to the theological task.

The Scientific Worldview and the God it Displaced

Science, a new method of grounding truth in experience, was able to apply its technique through the abstractions of "simple location," the "substance-attribute" way of thinking, and the dependence on sensory data. Such a view effectively organized research strategy for the natural sciences and fit well with a theology in which God was primarily thought of in terms of perfection and orderliness. But the honeymoon of natural science and theology did not last long, for God had been effectively left out of this worldview; and the complexity and changing nature of the world, especially of human social relations, were not accounted for in the scientific worldview. Neither were the grounds of order and causal connection clear. Both science and theology were impoverished by this inadequate cosmology.

Science: A new method of discovering truth. To understand the way in which scientific investigation may contribute to the theological task, it is important to know the nature of scientific investigation. What is basic to this fundamental new mentality of modern man? Whitehead has characterized it as ". . .vehement and passionate interest in the relation of general principles to irreducible and stubborn facts" (PR, p. 121). Science brought a new vitality to human experience. It freed Western civilization from the grip of authoritative church traditions, continually ordered and applied by the rational methods of the scholastics. Science grounded truth in something universally available, human experience.

Bacon<sup>3</sup> wanted a method that would be objective, so that the mind would not be "left to take its own course," but would be guided at every step, "as if by machinery," from systematic observation of details of experience to trustworthy generalizations. He compared his *Novum Organum* with mechanical tools, a tool for the mind. Clarity was provided by observation according to a predetermined method for reaching the general principles of truth from the true observations. The founders of our modern scientific viewpoint, notably Galileo, Kepler, Descartes, Spinoza, Newton and Leibniz, recognized another admirable source of clarity in mathematics. Mathematical deductions, utterly general and uncluttered by reference to particulars, could mean exactly what they were defined to mean. The combination of these two trustworthy sources of knowledge,

---

<sup>3</sup> Reference is to the preface to the *Novum Organum*, extracted in Stuart Hampshire, *The Age of Reason*, New York: New American Library Mentor Books, 1956, p. 23, from Bacon's *Works*, edited by James Spedding, R. L. Ellis, and D. D. Heath, London: 1857-74 (14 v.).



clear observation and clear mathematics, provided us with modern science, a means whereby we probe the orderly particulars of nature in order to grasp her universal laws and thus gain a measure of control. A method which moved with mechanical precision from observed, stubborn fact to general principles seemed to insure the truth of the outcome.

The usefulness of this method for creative encounter with the experienced world should be obvious. Reason was provided with a method which grounded it in observation, and human subjectivity was "removed," thus insuring that truth would be arrived at, regardless of who applied the method.

In order to make possible the conduct of science, with its useful method, certain simplifications abstracted key features of the world from the total given flux of things. Only recently has the full import of these simplifications and the limits they place on experienced reality been made clear. These key simplifications are expressed by the notion of "simple location," and by the "substance-attribute" way of conceiving of reality.<sup>4</sup>

The notion of simple location conceives the relation of material to space and time as being simply located at a particular time and place within an infinitely divisible extensive continuum. Thus, there is no inherent connection between portions of physical material occupying differing points of space, nor is time any more than mere serial succession, involving, "individual independence of successive temporal occasions" (PR, p. 159).

---

<sup>4</sup> Identification of these simplifications is dependent on Whitehead, SMW, especially Chapter 3, supplemented by relevant sections in PR.

In the substance-attribute way of thinking, "matter" is given substantive existence. It is treated as a *res vera* existing in and of itself, but it is not allowed any subjective experience. Thus, changes in these enduring substances must be explained in terms of secondary qualities which are accidental, changeable. These secondary qualities are seen as merely projected by the mind in order to clothe the bodies of nature. In this view, "nature is a dull affair, soundless, scentless, colourless; merely the hurrying of material, endlessly, meaninglessly" (SMW, p.80). And the mind, its own kind of substance, perceives, suffers, reasons, but does not interfere.

The new stress on observation as a source of truth, led to dependence on sense data as final "authority." This dependence was expressed by Whitehead as the "sensationalist doctrine" whereby "all knowledge of the external world arises by the mediation of private sensation" (PR, p. 165). This epistemology fit with the cosmology combining the notions of "simple location" and "substance-attribute" in the "doctrine of vacuous actuality," which was repudiated by Whitehead. According to this doctrine, actuality is comprised of passive, material substance, which has endurance, which exhibits essential attributes, but which undergoes accidental adventures (PR, p. 93, 363). Thus, actuality is reduced to "configurations of matter with locomotion in space as assigned by physical laws" (SMW, p. 60). Cause is reduced to efficient cause, the mere working out of forces experienced as the oppressive push from a given past.

Although there are problems with these simplicities, which will be discussed later, the worldview was admirably suited for inquiry into the order of the natural world. These abstractions have been successful

conceptual tools for organizing research strategies for the natural sciences, although even there their limitations are recognized. Their application to the social sciences has been problematic, as we shall see.

The honeymoon of natural science and theology. This worldview which provided the foundation for natural sciences, also fit the notion of God which was dominant in scholastic thought. Whitehead pointed out one feature in the scientific vision which is not self-consciously acknowledged, that is, the assumption of order. If all of the details of the observed world could indeed fit into a common statement of general principles, some grounds for the connections among things must be provided. But the scientific cosmology, with the simplifications just noted, did not provide for this. The confidence in order was inherited and uncritically accepted from the Christian vision of a God who created the world. The orderliness of nature was seen as a witness to the handiwork of God, the Creator who governed the "locomotion in space" of the "configurations of matter" according to his eternal laws. The early natural scientists could also act as theologians, assuming that in the discovery of God's laws in nature, they were allowed to think God's thoughts after him. The notion is still prevalent wherever great comfort and reassurance is taken in quoting some space scientist, chemist, or physicist who has found in the greatly detailed order of his scientific discovery a proof for the existence of God. The God at which the Christian world arrived through encounter with Greek philosophy was admirably suited to the needs of the scientific worldview. He was seen as the expression of perfection--immutable, impassible, timeless. This eminently real God was the unmoved Mover who set the world in motion. Whitehead characterized this God as the "aboriginal,

eminently real, transcendent creator at whose fiat the world came into being, and whose imposed will it obeys" (PR, 404). This God and the natural world viewed under the doctrine of "vacuous actuality" passed the pragmatic test. The natural sciences were able to flourish and to find expression in technologies that enhanced the quality of life, (which not only proved the usefulness of the abstractions involved in the scientific worldview, but was in harmony with a theological vision of manifest destiny). Humanity was realizing its role in the world as having dominion over the earth, acting as steward for the creator God, and enhancing the quality of life in that world through the exercise of God's eternal laws as they were discovered by the methods of science.

The divorce of theology from science. Such an understanding does not, however, anticipate the divorce of theology and science which occurred and the consequences of that divorce. God's creative act was distanced from the on-going world; it was seen to operate only as efficient cause at some remote beginning. The order of the universe was that of a clock or intricate machine created once and for all by God the great Clockmaker. Such a God was not needed to maintain the order of the mechanical world. Further, dependence on sense data, reinforced by the notion that actuality consisted of material substance simply located in space and merely responding to external forces upon it, made such a God hard to "locate." Because he was not perceived by the senses, he was either not real, or his reality was defined as applicable to some special realm, either a "supernatural" world, or the world of moral action.

Further, the fact that sense data did not provide any clues as to the relations among things, or their continuity through time, the

hitherto assumed sense of order in the world became problematic. Science itself was in need of a ground of order, the kind of ground provided by the God who had hitherto been assumed.

Finally, the emergence of the social sciences provided a further devastating blow to any sense that theology and empirical inquiry were compatible. The very search for "order" which had allowed natural scientists to identify their method and its conclusions with the laws of the creator God became a problem for the social sciences. The assumption that God acts in history provided the stumbling block of particularity. Reason's search for that which was universal, when confronted with the incredible diversity of human cultures, treated the chief exemplification of that cultural diversity, the religious aspect, as something primitive, and to be overcome in the name of the higher religion of rational inquiry, presumably through the sciences. Dependence on sense data did not help to clarify the differences of mores and folkways, but served merely to reinforce the differences. Continuity of the human species with other animal life was stressed in psychology and sociology where there was an attempt to clear these disciplines of any notions which might be construed as "spiritual," associated with the authority of the church tradition, and not from the facts established through empirical inquiry. Value questions were excluded from inquiry, since only the diversity of cultural values could be reported. In the realm of moral behavior, scientific inquiry seemed to be associated with a complete relativity of standards.

What were the consequences of this divorce of science from theology? For science itself, the new worldview ultimately proved to be a handicap, despite the amazingly pragmatic results of two or three

centuries of advance. The problem of how to achieve trustworthy data, when the illusions of sensory experience are well known, continues to be of concern. Also, empirical reality was narrowed in the name of better methods. Certain portions of human experience, like moral behavior, were systematically excluded from inquiry. There was increasing methodological rigor about less and less of reality. Increasingly, science was self-conscious about methods and unself-conscious about its basic assumptions and underlying abstractions. Also, there was no account of novelty and entropy was inevitable; the universe could only be considered as running down after having once been wound up. And with the Source of order effectively removed from on-going relation to the world, the attempt to establish ordered causal relations dominated the scientific task.

The divorce of science and theology had problematic consequences for theology as well. The very God who suited science's purposes as unmoved Mover, was effectively removed from the real world. In terms of the cosmology of the materialist doctrine, God was inaccessible to sensory experience, and his location with respect to the world was a problem. Even if the notion of God was retained for purposes of moral order, this was seen as value from some other realm and not accessible to the methods of inquiry used by natural sciences and emulated by the social sciences.

#### Process Worldview and its Renewal of Science and Theology

Whitehead's speculative metaphysics grappled with just this scientific cosmology in order to provide a more adequate conception of reality. By such revision of fundamental worldview, he has renewed the conduct of inquiry in both theology and science and the possibility of

their mutual interplay. The cosmological vision may be simplified in terms of a few concepts relevant to that which Whitehead termed the "fallacy of misplaced concreteness," which limited the vision of fundamental reality by overconfidence in the sometimes useful notions of simple location and substance-accident. The concepts will be used to expose the fallacy and to re-examine the problems of perception and causality so as to break the grip of a deterministic scientific worldview.

Whitehead's cosmological vision. Whitehead's account of fundamental reality provides bases for predicting order and accounting for novelty, both of which are important features in the world. In fact, whereas the scientific worldview took the relatively static order of falling bodies as its clue to the nature of reality, Whitehead took his clue from the human organism itself. Such a view was more adequate both to the Twentieth Century reformulation of physics in terms of relativity theory, and to our common sense experience. Whitehead posited that fundamental reality consists not of "static stuff", but of "fluent energy." Rather than the material substance which is potentially extensive in space, Whitehead said that reality is actually divided into atomic unities, "actual entities." Further, these atomic unities are momentary occasions of feeling, consisting of prehensions which take account of their past so as to become a unity of subjective feeling. This taking account is already an abstracting process, since each actual entity prehends or takes account of its entire past, some by inclusion in its novel becoming and some by exclusion from it. Each entity in its concrescing toward a final unity enjoys subjectivity; but as a completed concrescence it becomes available as object to all subsequent entities. This process is characteristic of all entities whatsoever, from atoms

to God. While most of the energy events which are the actual entities merely replicate the past which they inherit, thus accounting for the massive sense of order in the world, there is nevertheless real novelty. Each entity is free to prehend its past in its own way, that is by what is included or excluded; it holds in contrast the multiplicities which it inherits, both from the initial data with which it is presented and from the final aim which is presented for it from the primordial nature of God, in which potentiality is ordered with particular relevance to that entity's own becoming. Thus, while the entity's "physical pole" is replication of its past, in the sheer weight of its givenness, its "conceptual pole" allows novelty to arise in the later phases of concrescence as the initial datum is held in contrast with the final aim provided from the range of potentiality ordered in God. This conceptual pole becomes important wherever there is life, and especially where there is human consciousness. God provides for each entity a lure toward the initial aim which would realize the greatest good for the actual entity, toward the greatest realization of both harmony and intensity.

Whitehead's *ontological principle*, whereby he takes account of causality, states that there is no cause or reason which is not found in an actual entity, either in its role as prehending subject or its role as concresced object. There is real efficient causation, but it is not deterministic causation of external forces which cannot but be obeyed. But there is also "final causation," whereby the subject determines itself by prehending the externally given past, as well as the final aim which is provided as lure to its novel becoming. The potential for that entity is realized or not by the internal decision of the entity. The ontological principle must be coupled with the



*principle of relativity*, whereby each concrescent occasion expresses a particular perspective. The universe mirrors each actual occasion, and in each actual occasion the universe is mirrored, but from a particular perspective, depending on the determination made internally by the concrescing occasion. In such a scheme, relationships, and not merely individual and independent actualities, have ontological status.

Now, how has this vision of fundamental reality served Whitehead and us as a critique of the "fallacy of misplaced concreteness" and as a means of understanding the problem of perception in relation to causality? First, in the fallacy of misplaced concreteness, the novel abstractions which arise in conscious human perception of sense data were treated as fundamental categories for understanding an ordered reality. But problems arise when one tries to account for the orderliness of a related world through appeal to these abstractions. How could the doctrine of vacuous actuality, characterized by the notions of simple location and substance-accident, provide an account of connections among things and continuity through time? There is no inherent connection when portions of material occupy different points of space, or when time is mere serial succession. When "static stuff" is seen as basic, then change is also a problem. It is seen as produced by something external to the changing objects. The difficulty of reconciling the account of simple location with the unity of experience whereby we do seem to feel both "repetition" and "immediacy," both "endurance" and "change," is especially felt in the problems of explaining perception using the substance-quality, subject-predicate way of speaking. There are problems with the "sensationalist doctrine" whereby "all knowledge of the external world arises by the mediation of private sensation" (PR, p. 165).

Because our sensory impressions leave open the question about causality and connections, the scientific method has had to work hard to explain necessary connections through causal relations of events which are perceived through the senses. Increasingly rigorous application of the "rules" of hypothetico-deductive logic to observations gathered in more and more carefully prescribed operations does not solve the problem of human perception. It does not insure the connections of things, despite the admirable clarity of mathematical conceptualization. Therefore, Whitehead's analysis of perception is useful. He treats perception as a problem of *symbolic reference* relating two modes of perception to one another--that of *presentational immediacy*, stressing the vividness of sensory observations and measurements, and that of *causal efficacy*, stressing the vagueness of connections which are nevertheless felt, despite lack of clarity. This analysis accounts for both brute fact and novelty and allows both prediction of the order of nature and freedom for self-determination, which increased as one moves toward conscious human experience. Scientists encounter these problems in the symbolization they use to refer theory and observed data to one another. The kind of perception involved in common-sense human experience is that of the mixed mode of symbolic reference, which relates the two pure modes -- causal efficacy and presentational immediacy--to one another. Whitehead's analysis of the pure modes will be instructive for the understanding of the problems of symbolic reference.

The mode to which scientific accuracy aspires is that of presentational immediacy. In *presentational immediacy* "there is clear, distinct consciousness of the extensive relations of the world." The

contemporary world is consciously prehended as an "illustrated portion of the presented duration" (PR, 195), as a portion on the continuum of extensive relations. But this is perception in terms of the physical field's potential for extensive division and not its actual atomic division. We thus confuse the mere potentiality (of continuity) with actuality (which is incurably atomic). Contemporaries are causally independent of each other. Therefore, the world is objectified for us under the aspect of "passive potentiality." Hume and Descartes dropped the with-ness of the body, the direct knowledge of causal efficacy, and thus confined perception to presentational immediacy. The problems which arise through such preoccupation with presentational immediacy can be seen in the intense concern to establish causal relations among observed, independent facts through control and to achieve public verification for private, independent observers through replication. This is the mode in which measurement is presented. But the information thus acquired is merely information regarding configurations in space, indicating geometric relations to the body and not necessarily actual external objects and their relations. Presentational immediacy arises in the phases of concrescence associated with novelty.

In the mode of *causal efficacy*, attention is given the "with-ness" of the body. It is more visceral compared to the visual emphasis of presentational immediacy. It involves the less distinct, the sheer weight of the determined past. This mode produces

. . . percepta which are vague, not to be controlled, heavy with emotion: it produces the sense of derivation from an immediate past, and of passage to an immediate future; a sense of emotional feeling, belonging to oneself in the past, passing into oneself in the present, and passing from oneself in the present toward oneself in the future; a sense of influx of influence from other vaguer presences in the past, localized and yet evading local definition,

such influence modifying, enhancing, inhibiting, diverting, the stream of feeling which we are receiving, unifying, enjoying, and transmitting. This is our general sense of existence, as one item among others, in an efficacious actual world (PR, 207).

There are elements which scientific methods constructed for physical sciences have omitted. These are the causally effective relations, and not the ones we measure. These have a vector dimension, in contrast to the scalar dimension of presentational immediacy.

Aspiration to the clarity of presentational immediacy to the denigration of the vague causal feelings is closely tied to the problem of misplaced concreteness. In Whitehead's philosophy of organism, conscious human experience of sense data is related to the final phases of the concrescing occasion, where there is most novelty. Thus, far from providing the grounds for all reality, human sensory awareness is the most surprising element of nature. Far from dominant, human consciousness is in fact that which needs most to be accounted for in the scheme of things. A problem arises when we treat as fundamental categories the means of abstraction which arise in conscious experience of the most highly directed and purposive sort, such as scientific investigation. This makes human sensory perception, faulty and error-prone as it is, the basis for fundamental reality. But the sheer weight of causal efficacy, the order of nature that continues, is blindly assumed by science without any grounds.

The problem is the failure to realize that all our perception involves both presentational immediacy and causal efficacy. Our ordinary perceptual experience primarily combines the two in the mixed mode of symbolic reference. Though most scientific observation aspires to the clear, uncluttered relations of presentational immediacy, the mode of symbolic reference actually has more relevance to a science's task of penetration.

Says Whitehead, "We eke out our knowledge by 'symbolic transference' from causal perception to sense-presentation, and vice versa" (PR, 99). It is inadequate to think of abstraction as merely a problem of moving from particulars to universals. According to the principle of relativity and the ontological principle, we cannot divorce the particular from its reference to the universal, and vice versa. Each actual entity pervades the world and the world is mirrored in each actual entity. We cannot distinguish "universal" and "particular." Therefore, of a particular entity, we can only ask, "What is it fit for here?" (PR, 33). Thus, in Whitehead's definition of induction,

You will observe that I do not hold induction to be in its essence the derivation of general laws. It is the divination of some characteristics of a particular future from the known characteristics of a particular past (SMW, p. 62).

This definition accords well with current statistical theory in which particular samples are described carefully so as to allow proper extrapolation of their characteristics to their particular referent populations.

In order to predict particular futures (regarding marital role learning, for example) from a particular past, the interplay of the two perceptive modes is required.

This symbolic reference, though in complex human experience it works both ways, is chiefly to be thought of as the elucidation of percepta in the mode of causal efficacy by the *fluctuating intervention* of percepta in the mode of presentational immediacy (PR, 207, italics mine).

Symbolic reference is an "interpretive element in human experience."

This interpretive element, whether in linguistic or mathematical symbols, is the source of error in science, both the sought-for "error" of "precision," and the shunned error of "illusion." The following extended

passage refers to one of the common grounds whereby the two pure modes of perception can be brought together, the fact that the presented locus is the same for both modes.<sup>5</sup> The two modes express the same datum in "different proportions of relevance."

The respective roles of the two perceptive modes in experience are aptly exemplified by the fact that all scientific observations, such as measurements, determinations of relative spatial position, determinations of sense-data such as colours, sounds, tastes, smells, temperature feelings, touch feelings, etc., are made in the perceptive mode of presentational immediacy; and that great care is exerted to keep this mode pure, that is to say, devoid of symbolic reference to causal efficacy. In this way accuracy is secured, in the sense that the direct observation is purged of all interpretation. On the other hand all scientific theory is stated in terms referring exclusively to the scheme of relatedness, which, so far as it is observed, involves the percepta in the pure mode of causal efficacy. It thus stands out at once, that what we want to know about, from the point of view either of curiosity or of technology, chiefly resides in those aspects of the world disclosed in causal efficacy: but that what we can distinctly register is chiefly to be found among the percepta in the mode of presentational immediacy (PR, p. 197).

These insights will be related specifically to the method of exploratory/confirmatory data analysis, by which the problem area will be probed, later in the chapter. Whitehead's speculative reconstruction of a cosmology to avoid the problem of misplaced concreteness clarifies the dominant scientific concern for confirmation, for the control of error, for the identification of cause-effect relations which are trustworthy. It helps us understand the desire to ground science in sensory experience, with its scalar character lending itself to flexible measurement. But the "error" against which Newtonian scientific technique is prepared to arm us is primarily that of logical incoherence,

---

<sup>5</sup> Another ground is that there may be an identical eternal object ingredient in both modes. Whitehead discusses the grounds for symbolic reference at PR, p. 195ff.

and ignores the question about where the order arises which is the foundation for all our inferential procedures.<sup>6</sup> Our experience is through and through interpretative. To pretend otherwise cuts off possibilities of the free imagination and shifts error from mere logical incoherence to the significant error of empirical inadequacy.

The renewal of scientific inquiry. Whitehead's cosmology provides the means for restoration of the empirical roots of science by making us more aware of the limits of our abstractions in all phases of the scientific method. The achievement of order, for example, in the statement of theoretical relationships, is precisely through the act of creating novelty, the new view which allows us to see more clearly what is there in the givenness of reality.

Whitehead makes it possible to move from machine-like application of the method of induction and deduction, to science as a dynamic process that involves abstractions at all phases of inquiry. I have already indicated that Whitehead considers induction to be "derivation of some characteristics of a particular future from the known characteristics of a particular past," rather than the derivation of general laws from observation of particulars. Yet, the conduct of science still is largely conceived mechanically in terms of Baconian induction. For instance, one recent text in *Foundations for Behavioral Research* quoted favorably Peirce's estimate of the contribution of science to knowledge.

To satisfy our doubts, . . . therefore, it is necessary that a method should be found by which our beliefs may be determined by nothing human, but by some external permanency--by something upon which our thinking has no effect . . . The method must be such that the ultimate conclusion of every may shall be the same. Such is the method of science (Kerlinger citation, 1973, p. 6).

---

<sup>6</sup> Whitehead discusses science's blind faith in "order," in SMW, Chapter 1.

This ignores the role which human imagination plays in the act of research. Our abstracting capacity is indeed a means of achieving clarity, both the clarity of *observational accuracy* and the mathematical clarity of *imaginative simplification*. Thus, we are allowed to relate "irreducible and stubborn facts" and "general principles." But the creative role of human imagination in this process is not acknowledged when scientific method is conceived as mechanical application of the method of induction. Our very act of observing nature involves us as part of an interaction event. Our act of perception is already imaginative abstraction, suppressing detail in order to pay attention simply. What Whitehead allows is that this abstraction be acknowledged and used for the task of discovery and penetration of reality. He said,

We habitually observe by the method of difference. Sometimes we see an elephant, and sometimes we do not. The result is that an elephant, when present, is noticed. Facility of observation depends on the fact that the object observed is important when present, and sometimes is absent (PR, p. 7).

Whitehead relates this illustration of the elephant, which we notice when it is there, to his method in metaphysics, since the observation of metaphysical first principles is difficult. "We can never catch the actual world taking a holiday from their sway" (PR, p. 7). Thus, pure induction does not work for metaphysics. But neither does it work for natural science. The "play of free imagination" is as important to science as to metaphysics, and this is especially so when penetrating a new problem area. In contrast to the rigid empiricism of Bacon's method of induction, Whitehead says,

The true method of discovery is like the flight of an aeroplane. It starts from the ground of particular observation; it makes a flight in the thin air of imaginative generalization; and it again lands for renewed observation rendered acute by rational interpretation. The reason for the success of this method of imaginative rationalization is that, when the method of difference fails, factors which



are constantly present may yet be observed under the influence of imaginative thought. Such thought supplies the differences which the direct observation lacks (PR, p. 7).

Whitehead's calling attention to the simplicities which facilitated the conduct of scientific investigation in the physical sciences has reminded us that all science engages in the imaginative act of abstraction. We must beware lest we misplace the concreteness of the world on our abstractions and thus not recognize them as the simplicities they are. Our pragmatic, imaginative abstractions are allowed to narrow empirical reality in the quest for clarity. Through "simplified editions of immediate matters of fact" (SMW, p. 77), we gain the advantage of confining attention to "clear-cut definite things, with clear-cut definite relations" (SMW, p. 85). But abstraction excludes certain aspects of experience, and thus has this disadvantage: "In so far as the excluded things are important in your experience, your modes of thought are not fitted to deal with them" (SMW, p. 85).

Whitehead's critique of the scientific worldview and his alternative cosmology provides for science itself a useful perspective from which to evaluate the uses of abstraction in its method of inquiry. Later in this chapter, specific methodological implications are drawn from this analysis. This view of science, renewed in its grounding in empirical reality and in its self-consciousness about the role of human imagination in strategic simplifications of reality, will be more likely of use to the task of theology, also renewed by Whitehead's reconceptualization.

The renewal of theological inquiry. Theology, as renewed by the Whiteheadian vision, is more open to incorporating empirical findings and methodology within the purview of the theological task. This

renewed theological vision, discussed here in categories of process theology, is related to God's call and human responsiveness to it.

The God whom the scientific worldview removed from the world was primarily characterized in terms of perfection, understood as completion and immutability. The order in the world assured by this Unmoved Mover was a static order. Thus, novelty in the world was difficult to account for and God was banished from the on-going natural world. But this God was not the God of the biblical tradition or the God whom we know in Jesus. Whitehead's formulation of God's nature and his relation to the world restores the biblical understanding of a God who is continuously at work, in the world, and recognized there by his work of love.

As conceived in process theology, then, *God is continuously at work*. God is not primarily to be conceived as immutable, impassible, and timeless, which qualities remove God from a world in process. Rather, God is conceived as dipolar, prehending all actuality in his consequent nature, but also ordering all potentiality in his primordial nature. God prehends both actuality and potentiality. He re-enacts the order of the universe while he yet lures it to relevant novelty. Thus, the order in the universe is not the predetermined order handed down by fiat of a monarchical God. Rather, it is the order of a continuity, a dependability, a "repetition into novel immediacy." It is a statistical order, which allows also for the unpredictable, creative act of each free individual. Such a God is more in line with the understanding of reality which emerged in biological thought about evolution and in relativity theory in physics. It is also more in line with the biblical notion that it is the Redeemer who acts in Israel's history who is also Creator of the

natural world. It squares with Jesus' teaching about the radical presentness of God's reign in a Kingdom which is at hand, a presence further elaborated in the church doctrines regarding the Resurrection and the Holy Spirit. John B. Cobb, Jr. (1969, p. 42ff) has characterized this God as the "One Who Calls" us forward. His work through the Logos is that of "creative transformation" (Cobb, 1975), that is, taking what is given and luring it into relevant novelty.

The locus of God's action, then, is restored to the present world. In fact, in process theology *the world may be conceived as the body through which God acts*. Rather than a remote, totally transcendent God who is refused entry in the world because he is not material substance, or who is relegated to the initial wind-up of the universal clock, or who is exiled to some special realm of moral behavior or religion, this God as the Call Forward is intimately connected with the world. Of course, not all events in the world may be identified with God's purposes, as in a pantheistic view. But the God/world relation may be characterized as *panentheistic*. The world is in God, and while it exercises its freedom as distinct from God, it is greatly affected by his unitary embodiment of the world and his purposive intentions for it. Thus, empirical investigation of the relations that obtain in the world, both the order and the novelty, gives some clue to God's purposes in the world.

A criterion for recognizing God's purposes in the world is God's goodness, expressed in his love for all entities. *Love is God's characteristic way of acting in the world*. The Call Forward is not coercion by brute force. Rather, God acts through persuasive love. Wherever love is recognized, then God's purposes are fulfilled. Love may be inter-

preted in terms of God's desire for the highest Good for each entity and for the world as a whole. Thus, love affirms value achieved by letting it be. But love also enhances value by luring it to greater possibilities. The aims of God for the world are that each entity and the world will attain greater degrees of both harmony and intensity. Harmony, of course, aims at order, but it is an order achieved through drawing together into new, complex unities the particularities of the given world and relevant possibilities proffered by God. The novelty which thus emerges aims at intensity, the creation of a new harmony, richer, more important, expressing greater value than the previous order.

Now an understanding of the nature of the human who responds to the God of the Forward Call can be given. The above understanding of God may be paralleled as to the insight it enables for human self-awareness. First, some attention must be given to the limitations which the scientific worldview has placed upon the human. Such understanding is especially crucial in assessing the role which social sciences might be expected to play in theological reflection of the meaning of our humanity.

There has been a tendency to treat the human subject in the same categories appropriate for the rest of the natural world. Suzanne Langer (1951, p. 33ff), who studied with Whitehead, has criticized this reductionist view. She finds it revealing that the behavioral psychologists who reject all mentalistic notions of human behavior have made remarkable progress in advancing their view through use of the most abstract and "mentalist" operations available, modern mathematics. She points to the problems which science ignores when it sees scientific method as merely "recording and combining" sense impressions. This view

sees the mind as switchboard, merely transmitting "signals" which point to, announce, and are symptoms of things, the things we presumably contact in our sensory experience. This approach uses the logical system of purely abstract mathematics to control human error, but the errors of the human are not merely errors of failure of the sign to refer to its proper thing. There is a certain novelty encouraged by "symbols," which represent, remind us of, take the place of things. And for Langer, pointing to the evidence of religion, art, dream, and impractical ritual in human existence, "symbolic transformation" is a basic human need, which is overlooked when we merely identify human with animal needs. Thus, in scientific method, for example, we are not just concerned with how signs are used to record and combine sense impressions, but how symbols are used to "attain as well as to organize belief" (p. 26). One of the results of this novelty which the symbol allows, is the very diversity of human cultures which posed a problem for science conceived as merely describing God's lawful order.

Thus, just as we cannot conceive of God's nature as fixed, neither can we conceive of a static human nature. *The human is a unitary becoming*, showing a great deal of continuity and identity through time, but also remarkable in actualizing novelty, especially through symbolic capacities. The human work of "symbolic transformation" may be seen as parallel to God's work of creative transformation. The increasing rationalization of the capacity for symbolization not only destroyed the power of mythic identification with nature, but it also allowed the development of persons who experienced themselves as individual and free. Radically diverse means for handling the problem of individuality and

freedom<sup>7</sup> are foundational for understanding the pluralism of cultures we know to exist. Science itself emerged at the intersection of Greek and Hebraic cultural traditions, each with its characteristic development of symbolization around some determining perspective for organizing experience. The Greek perspective was determined by aesthetic distancing of objects given in nature, with great attention given to form, balance and proportion, aesthetically pleasing harmony. Science as discovery of the forms given in nature is a direct outgrowth of that Greek understanding. The logic of Baconian induction may be traced to this concern for abstraction and generalization in order to make inferences into the nature of an eternal world of harmonious order. The Hebrew perspective, however, was more determined by the relation to a divine Law-giver who calls, commands and promises. Israel's covenant with God is a verbal relation, a dialogue of mutual obedience to commitments, and not a form to be aesthetically contemplated. Ethical categories were dominant; one must obey the will of God and conform to God's will in righteousness. The world is seen as response to the eternal God who calls the world into being. Man's obligation is to be responsible to the God who calls. The Christian self-understanding further radicalized the Hebrew will, making one responsible not only for one's actions, but also for the intentions out of which the actions spring. This acceptance of radical responsibility for choosing to serve oneself rather than to serve the good of the other in love means that for scientific method, not only the actions performed in the operations of research must be responsible in the world, but also the motives for

---

<sup>7</sup> The discussion here and following is a non-technical summary of John B. Cobb, Jr.'s analysis in *The Structure of Christian Existence*.

research, and the limitations whereby we fail to see the other that is there because of our own self-centeredness. Such responsibility can be freeing if in response to a God who loves the world, including me, I take responsibility for a creative act of loving a portion of that world, letting it be in its freedom, and encouraging it, by my interaction with it, toward the greater good as defined by God's aim at harmony and intensity. Thus, the doing of science may be seen as the response to the Call Forward, interacting with this given world in which I find myself, and responding to God's love by offering myself in love to co-create with another the new moment that confronts us through God's aims at harmony and intensity.

Science can serve the Call Forward, interacting with the world so as to give people a transcendent view of themselves so they may become more responsible for their own becoming.

This understanding underlies the argument in the next sections indicating the way in which scientific methods may be conceived as a contribution to theological reflection.

#### How Empirical Inquiry May Contribute to Theology

Given the foregoing reconceptualization of cosmology, then, the scientific method may be reconceived so as to be more compatible with reflection on the nature of the God of the biblical tradition who may be chiefly characterized as the One Who Calls us forward. Because God is integrally related to the world, the description of social relations in that world may be seen as a means of identifying God's aims in sustaining world order. Further, because God is luring the world he loves to ever greater harmony and intensity, scientific method is one

means whereby persons may take responsibility for enhancing God's aims. These two notions, then, combine our view of the nature of God and the purposes of the scientific enterprise so that science itself may be seen as a contribution to the theological task.

Empirical inquiry helps identify God's aims in sustaining world order. Science is to be seen as one method among others; it "helps" to identify God's aims for the world. The order of the world is "sustained," rather than static; it is maintained through re-enactment, rather than given once for all. The re-enactment aims at harmony and intensity, so that the order is maintained precisely by being continuously incorporated into novelty in a unity of becoming. The scientist loves the world in its demonstrated order, and in the advance into relevant novelty which allows growth into harmony and intensity. This stresses the objectivity of the given datum since God loves the datum in its complex freedom. We emulate God's aims by our love of the data. Since each event mirrors its universe, and since its relatedness is given in each datum, careful description of the data allows already some understanding of the wider world in which the data operates. In my approach to science, then, there is a stress on the object which in its givenness confronts me. In statistics, for example, I pay attention to both central tendency and variance, to the median as well as to outliers, to dominant order as well as to the range of freedom. One must recognize the limitations placed on the object in its complex givenness by the use of summary measures as indicators.

This aspect of scientific method is similar to one theologian's characterization of the relation of reason and love. Daniel Day Williams (1968, p. 279) positively evaluated the "decisive aspects of man's



rationality which we owe especially to modern science." His analysis of reason places it close to the theologian's concern for love.

Whatever opens the person to the richness of the world beyond himself, whatever encourages the mind to give itself to the search for what is there to be known, whatever releases the person from defensiveness about his present structure of thought, and whatever overcomes distraction and triviality in the search for truth, contributes to the work of reason. And here surely we are not far from a definition of love (p. 287, 288).

Reason's "respect for the object and willingness to undergo self-correction" (p. 289) are requirements for any knowledge, just as "the requirement of openness to the other's being in his freedom," and "the break with self-centeredness," are requirements for genuine knowledge of other persons. Thus the scientist's valuation of brute fact and his rigorous attention to the limits of his abstractions are parallel to the theologian's concern for "that costly objectivity which requires transformation of the self for the sake of the relationship to the other in the truth" (p. 290).

Empirical inquiry takes responsibility for enhancing God's aims.

Not only does empirical inquiry help to identify what God's aims are, but it also becomes a way to take responsibility for enhancing them. For the Christian, this kind of radical responsibility is seen as an important response to God's ethical demand. Thus, not only does the scientific method help to open us up to the object, but it also offers self-correction in the ways we choose to appropriate the object. In the scientific interaction, what novelty does my own abstracting process introduce into my relation to the object? I must become open not only to the other that meets me, but also to my own becoming as it is affected by the other. God's aims at harmony and intensity are proffered both for me and for the subject of the investigation. The method not only

discovers something about what is given out there, but it discovers something new about the investigator. This is especially true when I am studying other human subjects.

Whitehead's analysis of perception has provided a means to become more self-conscious about interactions in which our symbols engage us. We are thus allowed to see both the power and the limits of our symbolic abstractions, bringing both novelty and error into the open so that they may play with each other. We must acknowledge the role of imagination in empirical method. The "fluctuating intervention" of successive, imaginative observations clarifies the vague, but persistent relations by which we feel prodded. We cannot stake all our claim at any one level of the "observation-imagination-new observation" process when we recognize the role of imagination and novelty in even our perceptual observations.

Science provides one means of becoming self-conscious about our symbolic transformation which emulates God's act of creative transformation. We are allowed to create the differences whereby we see better; we shatter the harmony in order to provide the novel view which may encompass a larger harmony.

Such a view of the scientific contribution is especially crucial in the social sciences, where the human subject is free. Science itself may be seen as a means of exercising freedom. It is a way of thinking God's other thoughts, not merely his ordered "laws" in the Newtonian scheme, but the acceptance and love of a radical pluralism, coaxing it all toward harmony. How does this fit together? Where is it all coming to? What are the trends and their meaning? These are just as important questions for discerning God's aims as the question of describing the

order that all seems to fit well. The investigator has a stake in the world which is subjected to scrutiny. He takes radical responsibility for his acts in the present and their intentions toward a future. In the social sciences, this involves risks. The novelty created by the research itself challenges the present moral order. Further information may truly clarify options, but it may also merely add to the confusion. If truth is already known, then further investigation is irresponsible. Is it worth the risk? The God of grace who operates by persuasive love can take the risks. Human responsibility assumes human exercise of freedom. The scientific enterprise is one marvelous example of that freedom to create novel ways of relating to the world in order to identify and coax it into the larger harmony and intensity which are God's intentions for it. Human responsibility also assumes that there is indeed an aim at a better order--more harmonious, more intense--which is the future into which the God of the Forward Call is luring us. Confidence in that Call to the future allows a radical openness now--openness to methods of investigation which enhance harmony and intensity, openness to subjects worthy of investigation, openness even to the confusion and pluralism into which the study of some subjects thrusts us.

We must be critical of idolatrous faith in the authority of religious pronouncements and of idolatrous reason which continually seeks fortification of its truth through methodological rigor. Both stand in the givenness of a neatly ordered world and resist the novelty which is creative advance. Faith and reason have been conceived as one in the recent work of John B. Cobb, Jr. (1975). He has identified the work of the Logos with the principle of "creative transformation." Faith is "the primal, appropriate response to God," and "God is the

Logos that calls men and women into the open future." Thus, "faith is reason in its struggle with all idolatries." Such an understanding of reason is inclusive of abstract and dispassionate analysis in the Greek heritage, as well as the method, vision, or doctrine of science. But reason is more than these.

It is the grasp of novel images, ideas, and meanings in their tension with and fructification of the achievements of the past and the willingness to submit itself continuously to further testing. It is participation in creative transformation. . . . The reason which is faith is disciplined imagination. It is not the mere application of existing methods and criteria, for it is that which creates methods and criteria and then modifies and transcends those which it has created. (Cobb, 1975, p. 93).

Scientific method provides one discipline for the task of responding to God's creative transformation. By attention to what is given, it assures that the novelty which is achieved is "truly relevant novelty capable of the creative transformation of the given." The practice of scientific inquiry provides one means of what Cobb calls "disciplined imagination."

Thus, science may contribute to theology's task, both by helping to identify God's aims in sustaining world order, and by taking responsibility for enhancing God's aims. In parallel to the work of the Logos in creative transformation, the researcher, through symbolic transformation, loves the world in its given complexity, and interacts with it in such a way as to coax it toward greater harmony and intensity.

#### A THEOLOGICAL VISION UNDERLIES THE CONDUCT OF THIS STUDY

I have now demonstrated that empirical investigation does indeed contribute to the theological task by helping us to identify God's aims and to encourage responsiveness to those aims. I have indicated why science and theology are sometimes conceived as mutually exclusive disciplines. A way of conceiving reality has been presented which

enhances the value of both scientific and theological inquiry as they supplement one another. Now that the value orientation of the theologian/scientist has been broadly identified, it is important to indicate the particular way in which the theological vision explained above enters into the conduct of this study. The theological vision is discussed in relation to the selection and statement of the problem, the theoretical perspective, and the methodology. Methodology is further elaborated in the final part of the chapter.

#### The Vision's Effects on the Problem Statement

The very fact that the problem of media influence on marital roles would arise is an outgrowth of the questions of meaning and value, concerns that have been largely bracketed in empirical investigation. The intention here is to make explicit the values underlying the feeling that media influence on marital roles is a problem, first with respect to marriage and second with respect to media.

Values related to sex and marriage. It is not customary to identify one's values in empirical research on marriage and human sexuality. But they enter into the investigation and it is best that these values enter explicitly. Just as one is careful to describe a sample for the purposes of replication and determination of relevant populations, it is important to describe the *sampler* so that interpretation of results can take into account the relevant assumptions.

The very fact that one does research on marriage and human sexuality issues may indicate to some a pre-judgment against traditional standards in these areas. If marriage is instituted by God, as the

church says it is, and if sexual behavior is already prescribed in the tradition of the church, then, some may feel that there is little point in investigating these concerns. For persons who already know what is right and wrong behavior in these areas, there would seem little point in investigating the nature and meaning of these concerns or of documenting variations in attitudes on these matters. But in line with the value of openness to what God is going to achieve harmony and intensity, the act of inquiry into sexual and marriage meanings is useful. What is happening in these areas of human concern? Are there really major shifts in practice and meanings? If so, where do the shifts fit into God's purposes? Can we identify God's aim at harmony and intensity in the concerns?

It is acknowledged that this research is affected by the positive valuation which Compaan (1973) gave to the expressive style of marriage.<sup>8</sup> Thus, the statement of the variable items used to represent the role dimensions reflect certain values. These values, which the investigator also affirms, are summarized here so the reader will be aware of any bias in findings and conclusions which may result from them.

These are the primary values which seem to be implicit in the marital roles as stated at p. 63ff. There is an affirmation of the wholeness of the acting person, who is a unity with freedom to act and choose out of the integrity of that unity. Also, love is a value which is sometimes achieved as order, sometimes as novelty. As order, there is a positive valuation of personal identity through time, reflected in

---

<sup>8</sup> Further relevance of this concern is discussed at p.152 . Detailed discussion of this style may be found in Compaan, 1973.

such concerns as fulfilling personal needs, and enhancing personal growth. But this identity of the individual is also seen in relation to commitment to a particular future, not only the person's own future, but a shared future with another person and a larger community. This commitment is reflected for example, in the concern that marriage be endorsed (though not constituted) by legal sanction, and that economic maintenance of the home is part of the marital task, and in the acceptance of another person in intimate sharing, even of unpleasantness in oneself. As relevant novelty, love is expressed in this relationship of openness to the other. Shared meanings and play are means of exploring the novelty which is the other person as are "depth" communication or intimate sharing which involve fulfillment of oneself through communication open to the other.

Values related to media. There are also underlying values in relation to the media. Just as there is not much research on the value and meaning dimensions of marriage and sexuality, so there is little research on the mass media with respect to values. Media as artful expression of values and as shapers of fundamental sensitivities and visions of reality are largely unexplored themes. Thus, this investigation tries to penetrate into a new approach to media, which assumes that there is a vision beneath the media messages. Diverse cultural expressions are made available and placed side by side in the "mass media." This very bringing together of radically pluralistic images is itself a push toward a more universal vision. Increasingly, we find ourselves in a common social matrix which forces the issue about the order that prehends it all and becomes a new, complex unity. Is one world vision really possible? John B. Cobb, Jr. (1975, p. 31ff)

appropriates Malraux's analysis of the Christ image in Western art to indicate that the Christ image which in art has overtly disappeared has become internalized as the principle of creative transformation in a universal art which embraces many traditions. The application of this analysis to the understanding of media images is tempting, although much more critical inquiry would be required. Nevertheless, this possibility provides some of the motivating power behind the investigator's concern about media influence. The very aspiration that media news, for instance, should "cover" the world, that hungry persons in Africa and India, or human conflict in Ireland, Lebanon, or Angola should enter into my purview is itself deeply rooted in the Christian vision of one world, which God loves and for which and in behalf of which he suffers to lure the world on to even greater harmony and intensity. In the Christian vision of reality, given its understanding of the sacramental nature of the world, the world is important, and any way of identifying the forms of the incarnation in that world is an important task. Part of the appeal of the media, especially the film, is that it is rooted in our fleshly givenness to one another, the photographic image is given movement analogous to the life rhythms of the body. Siegfried Kracauer's theory of the film as *The Redemption of Physical Reality* (1960) points to this Christian vision which underlies the concern about media images. Media parallel science in many ways, in their appeal to sense data and the problems and possibilities involved in just such an appeal. There is a daring adventure underlying both science and media as tools for seeing and hearing, for paying attention. That adventure is that the *particulars* of this pluralistic world may be loved, while the push toward a universal comprehension of the radical diversity may also be



affirmed and trusted. This has provided much motive force behind my investigation, and behind much science and film-making. Whether explicitly acknowledged or not, these human acts of symbolic transformation may be responses to and participants with God's act of creative transformation. They are means of loving the world in the Goodness which is given in it, and of luring it to its greater Good, more harmonious, yet more intense. In short, both this scientific study and the media which are the subject of study, are seen by the investigator as responses to the God who so loves the world that he gives himself to it.

#### The Vision's Effects on Theory Formulation

Increasingly, theory is seen in the sciences as a creative force in empirical inquiry (Merton, 1968; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Platt, 1964). It is not merely a summary of general principles achieved through adding up facts observed in relevant categories. Rather, theory itself has an important role in choosing *what* to observe, *what* categories are relevant. Especially when a field is new, it is important to be self-conscious about one's theoretical formulation and one's reasons for the choice of a perspective. Symbolic interactionist theory is concerned not only substantively, but methodologically, to take seriously the complications in scientific inquiry when a human observer studies other human subjects. The theory was chosen as consistent with the theological position and vision outlined above, it allows the human subject capacity for freedom, as well as the capacity for commitment. Symbolic interactionist theory attempts to be non-reductionist and non-determinist. "Behavior" for this perspective includes relationships, feeling, symbolic

action. Despite physiological correlates of these parts of the whole human response, behavior is not reducible to merely additive physical or electronic events. Both order and novelty are achieved through symbolic capacity. Reflective thought allows the consideration of alternatives, and choice, whether to merely repeat the past, or to act toward a novel future continuous with it. In symbolic interactionist perspective, this symbolic capacity is at the heart of the theory and not merely an explanatory appendage to an otherwise determinist view.

A review of aspects of this perspective which have already been stated will illustrate the way this valuation of freedom and commitment has already informed the theory statement. The organism is seen as active, goal-oriented, seeking to fulfill a line of action. The act is a social act, part of a life process of a group. Significant gesture allows freedom for readjustment. In the account of becoming a self, the person is seen as having a spontaneous "I" aspect, as well as the "me" expectations which provide continuity to the self. In discussion of roles, there was concern for the more flexible and dyad-specific "interactive" roles, as well as the more structured and specified "social" roles. The choice of an adult socialization approach to the study, assuming as it does the possibility of change in the adult, also is strongly rooted in a Christian tradition in which new life and "conversion" have been dominant ways of envisioning the radical freedom which is the human's potential. This same value is, of course, applicable in the choice of methodology. Symbolic interactionists are concerned that method is not atheoretical. More will be said below about symbolic interactionist approaches to method.

### The Vision's Effects on Research Methodology

Increasing standardization of methods, with rigorous rules for logical inference, often does not take account of the complexity of the real world, nor of the simplicities of our abstractions whereby we achieve clarity. Thus, we have greater love for the methods, which become idolatrous, diverting our love from the world, which our method should express. These values, then, dominate the approach to method in this study: Love the data (through observational accuracy) and enhance novelty (through imaginative simplicity).

*Loving the data* involves paying attention to a set of data in its full complexity. Observational accuracy is not merely for the sake of following some legalistic method, but for the sake of loving the object. Of course, "accuracy" of observation is already an imaginative simplification, so that loving the data in its complexity involves free use of whatever abstractions may serve as perspectives that help us to see better and to describe what is *given there*. The simple clarity achieved by "accuracy" is both the reward and the debt of human imagination.

*Enhancing the novelty* involves taking responsibility for the novel perspectives which are imposed by one's interaction with the data. Actually, the enhanced novelty allows a more accurate observation, for it is the cumulative experience of different perspectives which makes reality most understood in its fullness. This responsibility must be acknowledged wherever that novelty is introduced, whether at the level of the problem choice, definitions, theoretical perspective, choice of variables, measurements, analytic designs, or hypothesis-testing procedures. All these imaginative acts are crucial for loving the world, luring it toward greater harmony and intensity, but they need

to be recognized for what they are--limitations we place on our world in order to gain perspective.

The remaining section of the chapter focuses exclusively on the problem of methodology, with special attention to the problem of finding a method adequate to penetrate a new problem area. The fact that this is a new problem, and draws upon many disciplines, raises critical questions about methodology. But it is especially important to place this methodological discussion in the framework of this philosophical and theological perspective. First, it is precisely the new *method* of science which has been seen to exclude other sources of knowledge, for instance theological inquiry, and it is the method which is then seen as inappropriate for the conduct of theological inquiry. Further discussion of this fundamental epistemological question will be possible at the end of the chapter where the quest for a more adequate empirical discipline on the part of certain scientists enhances the possibilities long dreamed of, but little realized, that religious education could become a field that appropriates both scientific and theological tools of inquiry. Another reason that methodological discussion is so important at this juncture is that there is a growing ferment in the social sciences as to how much methodological rigor should be allowed to limit the problem areas studied. Again, this will be discussed in relation to the marriage and family field, a practical discipline in quest of a more disciplined scientific approach, and in relation to symbolic interactionist theory, which has creatively incorporated a wide range of research methods. Finally, statistical analysis has been seen as the *sine qua non* of scientific research. However, it is usually defined in the narrowest terms and thus focuses the scientific investigation so that good method is often equated with good statistical procedures.

Choice of variables and measurements often serves the end of quantitative tests of significance, rather than the quantitative conceptual tools being used to inquire and explore a problem. The method of exploratory and confirmatory analysis employed here is not standard procedure. Yet it grows out of a growing recognition of the need for exploratory data analysis, despite its limitations, to supplement the limitations of confirmatory procedures used alone. Thus, a major effort has been made to document the approach to data analysis which flows from the vision of reality here described.

#### THE CONDUCT OF EMPIRICAL INQUIRY WITH THEOLOGICAL IMPORT

The heuristic dimension of science is always important. Scientific method allows us to penetrate into what is *not* known of our complex environment by simplifying what *is* known. Thus, we gain leverage and a little bit of freedom in our interaction with a compelling environment. To penetrate--to search, to probe, to explore--is especially important in the investigation of a new problem or the emerging of a new discipline.

A research problem has been described which has recently emerged in a study discipline which itself is relatively new. With little explicitly relevant research as guide, the conceptual formulation of the problem of marital socialization drew on research and theory achieved through a rich diversity of methods, including the clinical case study of psychoanalysis, field observations of anthropology, laboratory experiments of learning theorists and social psychologists, and the survey method as elaborated in public opinion research.

These techniques, which have evolved into different research

methodologies each achieving wide consensual validation within particular communities of inquiry, were formulated in response to particular problems as probes toward penetrating those problems. In light of such diversity, it is important to justify methodology not only with reference to the present investigation, but also in relation to the increasingly standardized application of these ever more sophisticated tools of inquiry.

What is provided here is a rationale for the present research strategy, which is consistent with the values discussed above. It uses quantitative tools of inquiry both to confirm hypotheses and to explore data in search of further hypotheses regarding media influence on marriage roles. Exploration and confirmation are considered as conjoint aspects of a single heuristic process to penetrate a problem area.

As a heuristic discipline, science requires full attention both to *observational accuracy* and to *imaginative simplification*. Among investigators in marriage and family life, the latter has led to increased use of mathematical tools for abstracting and testing theory. But concern for the former has been a special concern for symbolic interactionists, who want to ground their observations in the complex concreteness of human interaction in natural settings. Exploratory/confirmatory data analysis will be justified as a method suited to combine both the observational and the imaginative tools needed to penetrate the problem of media influence in marital socialization. Finally, the chapter presents implications of this methodological discussion for the field of religious education's attempt to appropriate both scientific and theological methods of inquiry. Throughout, the concern is to clarify the quest for an imaginatively empirical heuristic

which is properly self-conscious about the power and limits of its modes of abstraction.

### Family Study and Symbolic Interactionist Perspective

Given the need to penetrate a new research area, marital socialization, it is important to place this study's methods in perspective within the marriage and family field, and especially the symbolic interactionist perspective. What is needed if science is to be a heuristic discipline of research/theory/practice, is full attention both to *observational accuracy* and to *imaginative simplification*.

In comparison with the natural sciences, or even with psychology, sociology as science is of only recent origin. In 1921 Park and Burgess (1924, p. 44) indicated that the discipline of sociology was just then emerging into a new phase, that of investigation and research. They reserved the term "research" for experiments guided by theory which could be "stated in the form of a hypothesis and subjected to a test of the negative instances" (p. 45). Four decades later, Christensen (1964, p. 16) indicated that family study was still shifting toward a scientific viewpoint, that is a trend to systematic use of hypotheses and more explicit theory building, with emphasis on quantification. Greater attention to theory can be seen in self-conscious development to theoretical frameworks of marriage and family study (Hill & Hansen, 1960; Christensen, 1964; Nye & Berado, 1966; Burr, 1973).

The diversity of these theoretical perspectives, however, reflecting a variety of practical motives for family research--education, counseling, social work, even theology--has resulted in a diversity of research methods ranging from case study to experiment, but with the

interview or questionnaire being dominant. Nye (1964, p. 250-252), reviewing family research data-gathering techniques from 1947 to 1961, indicated a trend to increasing use of interview and/or questionnaire as research instruments, so that by the 1957-1961 period, 80% of the studies used these techniques separately or in combination. For the same period, (1957-1961) nearly one-half used *no* statistical tests of significance and for those that did, chi-square analysis was the dominant mode. Ruano, *et al.* (1969, p. 691) reported on 444 empirical studies from 1962-68, 63.5% of which used questionnaire and/or interview; still nearly half used no inductive statistical tests, but 41% (of 444) used descriptive and inductive statistics, 28% used descriptive statistics only, 11% inductive only, and 20% used no statistical techniques. Chi-square analysis, though still dominant, was declining relative to other tests, including other non-parametric tests, correlation and other tests of association. More recently examples of multivariate analysis have appeared in the literature, for instance Bayer's (1969) use of path analysis.

Marriage and family studies reflect widely diverse theoretical concepts and research variables. Identification of common variables, their measurement and use to test hypotheses derived from theory is just beginning in the marriage and family field. Methods are needed to penetrate a relatively new field.

Rodgers (1973, p. 72,3) indicated that theory testing sometimes involved exploratory work, if the empirical data and the theoretical development of a field is sparse. Thus, while the goal of science may be explanatory research to test operational hypotheses derived from theory to specify anticipated empirical relations, social scientists



often need to begin with general research questions and identify relevant variables or discover additional ones or increase information on the relations of previously identified variables. The mathematical models for hypothesis testing are well known. Quantitative procedures to explore data are just coming into their own. Symbolic interactionist approaches to research, because they have not been mathematically oriented, have sometimes been called "soft science." However, Schvaneveldt (1966, p. 113, 120-121) said, "The interactional approach has probably done more than any other framework to remove family study from the realm of speculation to the field of scientific study and analysis." This was done by moving the family life field from library research and historical reconstruction to actual field observations and case-history studies. The perspective has long indicated that it is more concerned with penetration of a problem than with slavish adherence to tested methods of gaining truth. In Christensen (1964) and in Stryker's (1964, p. 143) appropriation for the family field of Rose's (1962) presentation of methodologic principles from symbolic interactionism, there is a tendency to associate case method with an anti-quantitative bias and less emphasis on "strict" theory testing. Symbolic interactionism's predilection for the life document<sup>9</sup> has made it useful to the family study field, which has been more oriented to observation in natural settings than to experimental manipulation. Stryker indicated, ". . .indeed, it seems fair to say that for some the major grounds for attraction to symbolic interaction theory is the

---

<sup>9</sup> Examples reported include Cooley's method of "sympathetic introspection" (Cooley once said that the motion picture was the ideal method to capture life process), and Thomas & Znaniecki's (1918-20) use of life history and case document.

support it appears to give for rejecting the use of statistical techniques." Although the polemic of quantitative versus non-quantitative methods has loomed large in many discussions by symbolic interactionists, the key to understanding their contribution to methodological discussion is not a non-quantitative bias. Burgess (1934), expressing a symbolic interactionist approach to family study methods, affirmed both case studies and quantitative procedures. Rather, the key contribution lies in the concern to be adequate to the empirical social world, which includes symbolic "definitions of the situation" as well as behavior, which is interactional and not merely "personal" or "cultural," and which is dynamic process and not merely static structure. Such an approach seems especially useful when one's task is to penetrate a new problem in a recently emergent field of study.

Blumer (1969, p. 1-60) has long engaged in polemic against those who identify better method merely with more refined statistical and experimental technique. His methodological position is stated with respect to the nature of symbolic interactionism and the principles of empirical science. Summarized briefly: "respect the nature of the empirical world and organize a methodological stance to reflect that respect" (p. 60). He argues that methodology embraces the entire scientific quest and not merely some selected part. Therefore, each aspect of the research process must meet the test of the *empirical world*, and not merely that of some particular scientific *model of inquiry*.

Early, Blumer argued for the exploratory aspect of this investigation:

What is needed is observation freely redirective and flexible in perspective. Scientific observation, as I understand it, is just this. It places emphasis on exploration, turning over and around, looking intently here and there, now focusing attention on this, now on that. It is flexible scrutiny guided by sensitized

imagination. One sees it clearly in the work of Darwin, who, incidentally, used neither instruments nor mathematics (1969, p. 1102).

Blumer argued for the use of "sensitizing concepts" and not just the dominant language of most statistical study.<sup>10</sup> The next paragraphs report the work of Waller (a family researcher), Becker and Denzin, all of whom made extensive reference to Blumer.

Waller (1934 in 1970, p. 117-130) indicated three means of getting insight. First, was "getting insight through the direct study of phenomena" (p. 122) (under which he discussed both strengths and weaknesses of experiment). The second, "studying certain symbols abstracted from reality and supposed to stand in a constant relation to it" (p. 120), included both verbal and mathematical symbols though he discussed primarily the uses and limits of statistical methods. In any consideration of methodology one must take account of the means of abstracting from the felt reality, whether that symbolic mode be the inadequate verbal reporting (the error in which statistics are designed to control), or the statistics themselves (which eventually find their way back into verbal discussion of findings). Waller also accepted a third means of obtaining insight, "sympathetic penetration," recognizing that "This kind of insight is peculiarly liable to error, but of all kinds of insight it is the most significant" (p. 120). For Waller, all three methods of obtaining insight are needed in the total research procedure. But, regardless of the method used, it is the penetration

---

<sup>10</sup> Meltzer and Petras, 1970, contrasted Blumer's approach and that of Kuhn, a symbolic interactionist who has been more optimistic regarding the possibility of operationalizing the theoretical framework, a task which he has done in the Twenty Statements Test.

of the problem, the "insight" into the empirical reality which provides the touchstone of its validity and not the method. Of course, there is a possibility of false insight. "But the remedy for false insight is not quantification or any mechanical test. Quantification will merely facilitate the elaboration of the error, and experiment will project it into another realm (p. 129).

Becker (1970) has criticized methodologists who deal with method only in terms of the logic of a narrow spectrum of scientific inquiry, "a concern for quantitative methods, for the a priori design of research, for techniques that minimize the chance of getting unreliable findings due to uncontrolled variability in our procedures," labeling these attempts to minimize human judgment "science-as-machine-activity" (p. 4,5). Thus problems which cannot be easily transformed to such procedures are either trimmed to more manageable problems or ignored altogether. Methodological problems which are neglected include, for Becker, "getting in" or obtaining permission to conduct a study, "avoiding error" (methodological safeguards), "choice of frameworks" (theory), "hidden assumptions," and "developing hypotheses" (p. 14-23). Becker has also made a positive contribution to the method of participant observation.

Though relevant to the task of penetration, these persons' polemic against the dominant statistical techniques may not appear directly relevant to a multivariate analysis of survey data. Denzin (1970) has most adequately summarized the methodological concerns of symbolic interactionism, while yet appropriating the contribution of methodologists concerned about mathematical control of error. He was concerned with gathering data concerning time order and covariance

between variables and with discarding rival causal factors, chiefly expressed through the conditions of internal and external validity articulated by Campbell (1963). Beyond that, he articulated these interactionist principles:

1. Symbols and interactions must be combined, before an investigation is complete.
2. The investigator must take the perspective or "role of the acting other" and view the world from his subjects' point of view--but in so doing he must maintain the distinction between everyday and scientific conceptions of reality.
3. The investigator must link his subjects' symbols and definitions with the social relationships and groups that provide those conceptions.
4. The behavior settings of interaction and scientific observation must be recorded.
5. Research methods must be capable of reflecting process or change as well as static behavioral forms.
6. Conducting research and being a sociologist is best viewed as an act of symbolic interaction. The personal preferences of the sociologist (e.g., his definitions of methods, his values and ideologies, etc.) serve to shape fundamentally his activity as an investigator, and the major way in which he acts on his environment is through his research methods.
7. The proper use of concepts becomes sensitizing and not operational; the proper theory becomes formal and not grand or middle-range; and the causal proposition more properly becomes interactional and universal in application (Denzin, 1970, p. 19).

Of direct relevance to the macro-description of research process which concludes this chapter is Denzin's appropriation of both the tradition advanced through experimental design and statistical inference, and the symbolic interactionist concern for the empirical social reality of the human document--interacting, in process, behaving toward social objects defined through significant symbol. In the former, he has maintained the flexibility and imaginative abstracting power of mathematical models. In the latter, he has reminded us that these abstractions are subject to the full empirical reality observed in human interaction. He elaborated his methodological position, not by polemic as to which is more scientific, but by analyzing the abstracting

power and limits of various research methods with a view to the interaction each allows between researcher and data and to the overall insight which emerges through the triangulation of the various techniques. He identified five major methods--experiment, survey, participant observation, life history, unobtrusive measures. His central proposition was:

that each method represents the sociologist carrying on a different form of symbolic interaction with his environment. Our position holds that research methods are not sterile atheoretical tools. Instead, they are symbolically laden lines of action that represent one or another of the major forms of interaction the sociologist carries on as he moves from theory to reality (1970, p. 448).

Thus, "Each research method reveals peculiar elements of symbolic reality." And each researcher lends something of uniqueness to his use of the method in a world which is itself in flux and change.

Reflecting a concern that sociologists not abandon theory development for merely refining methods and skills of verification, he said,

My own concern with combining principles from interaction theory and causal analysis represents a dual interest in *discovery* and *verification*. Interaction theory tells the sociologist how to approach empirical reality; the principles of causal analysis tell him how to identify valid, correct, and reproducible observations. The two problems are inseparable, and until sociology has a set of criteria that permits *discovery* and *verification*, the separation between theory and method will persist (p. 27-28, italics mine).

Denzin has pushed to the border of a viewpoint which is crucial for stating a scientific strategy sufficiently heuristic to penetrate new problem areas. He has called attention to the kind of symbolic interaction which each research technique allows. This sets the stage for discussion of quantitative inquiry as a method of penetration.

Loving Data Toward Order and Relevant Novelty

Exploratory/confirmatory data analysis defined. A rationale has been presented for a style of inquiry which is at once more adequately empirical and more attentive to its abstractive processes. Now data analysis may be discussed in light of previous arguments for method suited to penetrate empirical complexity and thus clarify important aspects of the problem. Whitehead has said that "understanding" requires both *penetration* and *completion*. Though he refers to these two, respectively, as "vibrant disclosure" and "deadening closure" (MT, p. 81), he nevertheless sees the two as necessarily complementary.

The sense of penetration, which also clings to our experience of intelligibility, has to do with the growth of understanding. To feel the completion apart from any sense of growth, is in fact to fail in understanding. For it is a failure to sense dimly the unexplored relationships with things beyond. To feel the penetration without any sense of completion, is also to fail in understanding. The penetration itself is then deficient in meaning. It lacks achievement (MT, p. 66).

This section describes the macro-process of research method, whereby knowledge is achieved through the joint contribution of penetration (exploration, probing after the unknown), and of completion (confirmation, encapsulating the known). The terms *exploration* and *confirmation* take on special meanings for the research process in the work of John Tukey (1960, 1962, 1969, 1970; Mosteller & Tukey, 1968), a data analyst. What is meant by the term Exploratory/Confirmatory Data Analysis?

"Data analysis," as used here, does not mean merely "statistics" in the sense of a mere logico-deductive system. For Tukey, a statistician, data analysis is a discipline in its own right, which is intrinsically empirical. It is willingness to apply formal statistics to "dirty data."

Tukey (1962) thinks the data analyst must face up to more realistic problems, the necessarily approximate nature of useful results, the need for collecting results of actual experience with data-analytic techniques, and the need for iterative procedures in data analysis. "Data analysis" is further clarified by examining the dual aspects of such analysis: exploration and confirmation.

Later, this chapter will examine the background for "exploratory" and "confirmatory" analyses in the sense in which Tukey uses them. Meanwhile, "exploratory" may be loosely associated with "descriptive" studies; "confirmatory," with "explanatory." The former, usually heavily (or entirely) dependent on descriptive statistics, is usually associated with generating hypotheses, while the latter uses inferential procedures for testing hypotheses. Tukey's work is continuous with this tradition, but not confined to it. Perhaps the single metaphor which best expresses his approach to defining exploratory and confirmatory is this: "Exploratory data analysis is detective in character. Confirmatory data analysis is judicial or quasi-judicial in character" (1970, p. 1-2). "Both exploratory and confirmatory data analysis deserve our attention. Both detection and adjudication play crucial roles--in the progress of science as in the control of crime" (1969, p. 83). Though Tukey does not explicitly define each, these terms are elaborated in many of his articles, especially "Analyzing Data: Detective Work or Sanctification" (1969), and in the introduction to his text *Exploratory Data Analysis* (1970). Here is a fairly concise summary of what Tukey means by Exploratory analysis:

In exploratory data analysis there can be no substitute for flexibility, for adapting what is calculated--and, we hope, plotted--both to the needs of the situation and the clues that the data have already provided. In this mode, data analysis is



detective work--almost an ideal example of seeking what might be relevant (1969, p. 90).

Such analysis Tukey considers the first step, the necessary foundation for subsequent confirmation. Flexibility and adaptation are important strategies. In exploration, "One body of data can--and usually should--be analyzed in more than one way." Also, "Bending the data to fit the analysis can be vital. . . But bending the question to fit the analysis is to be shunned at all costs." "Looking at data" is stressed, as is "examining indications," because "We want to know what the data *seem* to say . . ." (1969, p. 83). "Indication" is an important concept for Tukey and needs to be understood in relation to his exploratory concern. An indicator is "Any of those things that have been drawn from a body of data to exhibit at least one aspect of what that body can suggest" (Mosteller & Tukey, 1968, p. 98), provided that, 1) each observation may contribute to it, and 2) it is expressed so that at least some who are interested in the subject can think about its interpretation. An indicator, as numerical or graphical summary, may be a typical value such as the mean or median, a measure of spread, a measure of association. It may be the result of a statistical analysis, or it may be such ad hoc and informal procedures as bumps on curves or the wiggleness of a graph. An indication is a clue whereby the data points to something of interest.

Confirmatory analysis is concisely stated here:

The principles and procedures of what we may call confirmatory data analysis are one of the great intellectual products of this century. In their simplest form, these principles and procedures look at a sample--and at what that sample has told us about the population from which it came--and assess the precision with which our inference from sample to population is made (1970, p. P-1).

Whereas the exploratory work was primarily concerned with "breadth of possibility," confirmation is more concerned with "seriousness of

analysis" (1970, p. I-1). Rather than concern for pure indication, this aspect of analysis deals with "how to express the uncertainties of particular kinds of indications" (Mosteller & Tukey, 1968, p. 98). Confirmation has to do with adjudication, with "guidance counseling" (1969, p. 90). It is "the means by which we adjust optimism and pessimism, not only ours but those of our readers. . ." (1969, p. 90). But such counsel is not to be taken as "an imprimatur or a testimony of infallibility," for "Sanctification is only for dead data" (1969, p. 90). In relation to confirmation, it is useful to understand Tukey's concern for "Conclusions" (1960, p. 423-433). Over against decision theory, in which we try to maximize the probabilities of making a "good" decision given a particular situation, conclusion procedures seek broad relevance to guide theory and add to the body of knowledge. "Conclusions" can be accepted as part of a selection of alternative working hypotheses which are judged by long-run effects for their "truth." Such conclusions are accepted until unusually strong evidence to the contrary subjects them to rejection at some future time. Conclusions are not achieved by merely attaching a confirmatory statistic to a single study. Rather they are based on many judgments and on replication of results over time. While confirmatory research is most obviously related to the concern for conclusions, exploratory work is an important source of new knowledge. Exploration is the first step, the foundation. Indication and conclusion need to be taken together. So we must think of research in general and of data analysis in particular as a single dynamic process, exploratory and confirmatory.

The following sections will clarify these questions. First, what are the uses of exploratory data analysis? Then, what are the

hazards of exploratory work used alone? or of confirmatory work used alone? Finally, what are the benefits and possibilities of their conjoint use? Along with this final section we indicate developments in data analysis which make such conjoint use possible for present research.

The uses of exploratory work. What role has exploration played (in relation to confirmation) in data analysis? Documentation of the growing concern for exploratory analysis is needed. Exploratory work, which is so crucial for this investigation's need to penetrate a new subject area, has been underplayed in the literature. Considering the extreme rigor which is attached to confirmatory testing of hypotheses, it is surprising that so little attention is given to how these hypotheses are derived. Standard texts and official journal article reports of methodological procedures give little space to discussing the task of generating hypotheses. To fill such a gap, Tukey's first volume in a two-volume text is *Exploratory Data Analysis*. Among the few texts providing any reference to exploration as a strategy in research methods, DeGroot (1969), Simon (1969), Hendrick and Jones (1972), and Kerlinger (1973) are perhaps most positive, though in each it plays a minor role in a presentation otherwise devoted to confirmatory procedures. Among statistics texts, Hays (1973) provides passing indications of openness to exploratory techniques, though confirmatory procedures dominate his presentation. Articles by McGuire (1973) and Verplank (1970) call attention to the need for more flexible data analysis and more attention to exploratory procedures. Useful summaries of the status of exploratory research can be found in Selvin (1968), Kruskal (1968), and Kerlinger (1969). The uses of exploratory data analysis are first discussed with

reference to field studies, then to survey work. Finally, statistical developments which affect exploratory work are reported.

A major impetus for exploratory work has come from disciplines oriented to field work as a means of data gathering. For instance, in a collection of articles on survey research (Glock, 1967), it is the chapters on anthropology and social welfare which discuss exploratory study. Discussions by Katz (1953) and Selltiz, *et al.* (1959), both related to field work methodology, provide a view of exploratory work which is still commonly held.

Katz (1953, p. 74-83) defined two different kinds of field studies--exploratory and hypothesis testing. Whereas exploratory research wants to "see what is there," hypothesis testing is concerned to "predict the relationships that will be found." Exploratory research is the earlier stage of a science, especially useful in field studies and surveys where a broad problem area is under investigation dealing with a wide variety of measures. Hypothesis testing, offering more definite proof, is characteristic of the lab experiment where control, specified conditions, and detailed measurement are possible. The former approach is more inductive; the latter, more hypothetico-deductive. Katz points out that "exploratory" does *not* mean "unfocused and diffuse." Such research requires careful design. For Katz, there are two primary functions of exploratory work--to discover significant variables in the situation and to discover significant relationships between variables.

Selltiz, *et al.* (1959, p. 50-78) divide the first, exploratory phase into two parts, exploratory (or formulative) and descriptive, and like Katz, call their third stage, "testing causal hypotheses." There is an increase in use of statistical tools as one moves toward testing hypotheses. Survey research is largely identified as descriptive, with

statistics used to minimize bias and maximize reliability. Testing hypotheses is associated with the controlled experiment, with statistical tools here used to make inferences from observed samples to hypothetical populations. (The authors feel that survey data can be used to make inferences and test hypotheses only in a very limited sense.) Outside of some use in accurate description through frequency counts, they do not see data analysis as an exploratory tool. The techniques for their formulative stage include literature survey, interviews, and various case studies.

Rodgers (1973, p. 71-84) applies essentially the same categories in his discussion of operationalizing theory in the study of family interaction. He says that whether one does *exploratory* research, beginning with general research questions that seek clarification and a broader base of knowledge, or *explanatory* research, beginning with theoretical propositions that can be tested as operational hypotheses, depends on both the degree of theoretical development and of supporting empirical data. The one tests theory, the other assures that theory grows out of a broad empirical base.

To summarize the field work tradition, exploration is seen as clearly preliminary to hypothesis-testing, useful to discover variables and their relationships. Statistical summary or indication, if used at all, is used merely to rationalize observation and lend some order to description and classification. The survey has been used as an instrument for rationalization of the field interview and not to make inference to theoretical populations. We turn now to a discussion of the role which survey analysis has had in the development of exploration techniques.

In 1946, Merton (1967, p. 157) discussed "the bearing of empirical research upon the development of social theory." Encouraging a role for empirical investigation beyond merely confirming or refuting hypotheses, he pointed out the value of the "serendipity" pattern in which "observing an unanticipated, anomalous and strategic datum" causes one to rethink his hypotheses and thus to formulate new theory (1967, p. 157). The richness of survey data has been exploited for just such purposes. A deliberately exploratory tack can be seen in the strategy of Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet (1965), who deliberately collected a wide variety of information regarding voting behavior so that possible relations might be discovered. Kendall & Lazarsfeld's (1950) classic discussion of problems of survey analysis presents secondary analysis, after one has tested for hypothesized relations as a means of exploring unexpected results. This survey analysis tradition has been solidly established in the work of Hyman (1955, 1972), Rosenberg (1968), and Hirschi and Selvin (1973). The tradition is based on the examination of correlations of pairs of variables and the influence which the introduction of a third variable has on the relationship. Problems in the analysis of survey data are presented in Kish (1959), who discusses the survey's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the experiment. Selvin and Stuart (1966) have recently discussed some statistical tools for exploratory examination of survey data in what they call "data-dredging procedures." Such procedures are discussed as a means of searching for new hypotheses by Simon (1969), who also discusses the problems of evaluating significance of "dredged up" relationships (p. 412-419).

Thus, the survey strategy has rationalized both exploratory and confirmatory aspects of data analysis. A tool which Selltitz, *et al.*

(1959) considered merely descriptive has been used increasingly as a means of hypothesis-testing, providing rationalization through quantified data obtained in "natural settings." A major use of the survey instrument has been exploration, providing a means of maximal use of data rich with variables through extensive reanalysis of their relations, not only to discover "serendipity" effects when anticipated results fail or anomalous findings require explanation, but also as a conscious strategy for generating hypotheses.

These descriptions indicate the increased rationalization of observation through quantitative means. Thus, the results of experimentalists' discussions of statistical paradigms have filtered into the nonexperimental sciences. Further statistical developments are increasing the use of quantification in what have been earlier, exploratory phases of investigation. Examples include techniques for analysis of qualitative data (Light, 1973), the persistence of non-parametric techniques (Siegel, 1956), the development of planned and post-hoc comparisons to apply confirmatory tests of significant differences among group means to the exploratory task of "snooping around" in data (Kirk, 1968, chap. 3; Hays, 1973, p. 581-615; Keppel, 1973, chap. 8) and the development of factor analysis in psychology (Cattell 1966). These are reported merely to indicate the way mathematical models have increasingly informed the exploratory aspects of investigation, so that one can no longer merely associate exploratory work with non-quantitative field work preliminary to quantitative hypothesis-testing. Exploratory concerns have been recognized even by those most rigorously concerned for experimental hypothesis testing, as later paragraphs will demonstrate.

Thus, Tukey's concern for exploration has precedents. In field

studies and in the survey tradition, exploration has developed beyond mere acceptance as second-rate research which must be superseded by the superior hypothesis-testing. It is increasingly seen as the necessary foundation by its discovery of penetrating hypotheses. Quantitative procedures are making exploration more rational, providing a means of organizing data, of looking at indications, of examining the "fit" to a formal statistical model by comparing "observation" with the "residual" which does not fit, and thus a means of immersing oneself in the data, probing until one understands it and not merely "proving" a hypothesis by reference to a single pre-determined analytic procedure. Fluctuating attention to measured details and to calculated summaries lure us from the neat definiteness of presentational immediacy to the vague, complex "beyond" which we feel in causal efficacy. The information-laden complexity of phenomena is preserved in the various means whereby data is presented and manipulated and not merely sacrificed to a statistical test using a single summary statistic. By looking and re-looking until we understand, we correct our observations in the mode of presentational immediacy and push toward the vague problem area which wants to reveal its own parsimoniously structured givenness.

The hazards of exploratory analysis used alone. The increased quantification of even exploratory procedures raises questions about the validity of such pretension to confirmation procedures. What are the hazards of exploration, if used alone? Exploration cannot be used as an excuse for poor design and sloppy thinking about one's research problem. Katz (1953) emphasizes that, even for exploratory study, one must limit his *data* so that significant variables will be discovered and limit the research *problem* to discover significant relations between



variables. Nor can it be used as a "second-best" report to salvage material which through carelessness or some other reason does not meet the conditions required of confirmatory research (De Groot, 1969, p. 307). Failure self-consciously to state one's problem and to direct research toward theoretical development is a hazard arising in the misuse of exploration.

Kish (1959) discusses misuses of statistical tests which constitute hazards for solely exploratory research. He warns against "shot-gun hunts for significant differences." When hypotheses are not stated ahead of time, some spuriously significant relationships will appear by chance. De Groot (1969, p. 54) refers to this as selection ad hoc, a procedure "capitalizing on error." Kish also warns that it is easy to confuse statistical significance for substantive significance. Nearly any result can be made significant if the sample  $n$  is large enough, a common strategy in survey research. And even an insignificant result may have substantive significance for a small sample. There is a growing trend to supplement tests of significance with measures of association as a means of indicating the predictive power of a relationship by reference to amount of shared variance (Kerlinger, 1973; Moser & Kalton, 1972, p. 447; Kish, 1959, p. 115). Kish's analysis of shortcomings in survey research reveals two more hazards if exploration is used alone. There is less control than in experiments, though he says the degree of control in either method is relative and not absolute. And discovered correlations of survey results do not clarify the direction of causality.

The hazards of confirmatory analysis used alone. This lack of control in the survey which is an exploratory hazard also provides a

criticism of solely confirmatory research, for as reported above, control is relative. Also the exploratory problems of finding spurious relations or confusing statistical with substantive significance, are applicable in varying degrees to any research strategy using quantitative methods. Fisher's ultimate test of substantive significance was the repetition of consistent statistical results significant at the .95 level. Experimental research without replication is as subject to significant results by chance as exploration. The "flap" over significance testing in experimental research summarized in Morrison and Henkel (1970) indicates that the question of statistical and substantive significance is a hazard for both exploratory and confirmatory research. The complaint is often expressed that results obtained in artificial experimental settings are not applicable to understanding "real life" dynamics. A related criticism made against statistical tests of experimental hypotheses is that they tend to triviality or meaninglessness regarding substantive matters under investigation. For example, Madge (1953) says,

. . . the more precise techniques are most easily employed when the probing required is at its minimum; because the subject has become familiar to the investigator and the situation has been relieved of its tension. Quantitative methods are customarily found in use at what has then become a superficial level of inquiry; the fact that they can be used at all implies that the process of penetration, the baring of the problem has already taken place (p. xxix).

Lest this be taken as mere polemic against quantitative procedures, Tukey, a statistician, may be quoted:

Far better an appropriate answer to the right question, which is often vague, than an exact answer to the wrong question, which can always be made precise (1962, p. 13,14).

Experimenters are becoming more aware of the many sources of human error which necessitate cautious interpretation of even

confirmatory results obtained through the most rigorous experimental controls. Experimenter bias is well-documented (Rosenthal, 1966), as is the Hawthorne effect bias arising from the human subjects (Homans, 1965). Thus, in contrast to the increasing rationalization of exploration by borrowing quantitative techniques developed for experimental research, now we see in confirmatory research increasing recognition of the complexities of the research process and the impossibility of total control. "Some data," even though not meeting all the theoretical conditions for good hypothesis-testing, is preferred to "no data." "The best we can do" often leads even the most experimental investigators to face basically exploratory problems, as seen in the tradition relating to the "ex post facto experiment" (Chapin & Queen, 1937; Chapin, 1955), the attempt to organize previously-gathered data in the manner of experimental research design. Kish (1959) reserves "ex post facto experiment" for designs which randomize uncontrolled variables, but with this note, "Sample surveys and controlled investigations have their own justifications, their own virtues; they are not just second-class experiments" (p. 111). Campbell & Stanley (1963) recognize the importance of what they call "quasi-experimental designs."<sup>11</sup> Campbell (1957, p. 213) says, "Experiments probe theory, but do not prove theory. Any data that probe theory are worth looking at." The Campbell & Stanley article encourages flexibility in the design of experiments, with their varying degrees of control, to render implausible any alternative

---

<sup>11</sup> The term is derived from W. A. McCall, *How to Experiment in Education*, 1923. Campbell and Stanley (1963, p. 1) deem the following quotation as applicable enough to serve as the "leitmotiv" of their own presentation. "There are excellent books and courses of instruction dealing with the statistical manipulation of experimental data, but there is little help to be found on the methods of securing adequate and proper data to which to apply statistical procedure."

explanations of observed relationships. Blalock (1964) stresses the "underlying similarity" of "experimental and nonexperimental designs" with respect to the logic of causal inference:

The point we are emphasizing is that no matter how elaborate the design, certain simplifying assumptions must always be made. In particular, we must at some point assume that the effects of confounding factors are negligible. Randomization helps to rule out some of such variables, but the plausibility of this particular kind of simplifying assumption is always a question of degree (p. 26).

A final criticism against a strictly confirmatory approach is that the narrow focus on the quest for precision does not allow us to gain the breadth of understanding which can be had by playing with and looking at complex, even inconsistent data. For example, the search for underlying samples or the analysis of outliers are not usually part of a strictly confirmatory strategy. A confirmatory approach, dependent on "adequate and proper data," needs exploration of the best we have in order to increase adequacy. Routine hypothesis-testing by prescribed tests of statistical significance provides a special set of blinders against the "novelty" upon which exploratory investigation capitalizes by its strategic exploitation of serendipity. Thus, by its extreme focus to control logical inconsistency, confirmation alone excludes broadly empirical adequacy.

Exploratory/confirmatory data analysis. Having discussed the uses and limits of exploratory analysis, and the limits of the confirmatory mode, we now may consider the relation of the two in an iterative research style which is adequate to an entire process, including "research-knowledge-practice" (Harrison, 1970). Now Tukey's concern for exploratory/confirmatory data analysis and Whitehead's analysis of perception may be combined to elaborate the research style which will

guide the explicit description of the methods of this present investigation.

The problem of perception creates major problems underlying both confirmatory and exploratory procedures. It is rightly assumed that observation is the ground of empirical inquiry. But when such observation is taken to be the chief grounds of reality, then we commit the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. All scientific method, from the act of observation, through the testing of hypothesis, to the achievement of verifiable theory, is laden with the "problem" of human imagination and error. To concentrate solely on the precision of observation and its measurements, in the mode of presentational immediacy, is to ignore the problems of symbolic reference whereby we hope to relate our scalar dimensions to the vector quality of our vague feelings in the mode of causal efficacy. The very sensing of a problem in practice is one witness to the mode of causal efficacy; the desire to state a theory illustrating the connexity of events in our experienced world is another such witness.

This relation of the two modes of perception is not adequately accounted for in a research model conceived solely in terms of induction and deduction. In spite of the breakdown of the method of strict empirical induction (Whitehead, PR, p. 7), most thought regarding scientific method is still dominated by inductive-deductive logic. For instance, Hays (1973, p. xi), on statistics speaks of "making inferences," in order to describe "the general relations among events." It is seen as a problem of "observation" and "generalization," a "process of going from the specific to the general." In such an approach, though we are forced to recognize the limits inherent in moving from a sample to a population,

these limits are seen primarily as merely the limits of an observer who cannot test every instance because he is simply located with respect to his quantity of available time and mobility in space. But the limits inherent in observation are not merely an inadequate quantity of time or space. The limits are qualitative limits due to the fact that any observation contains *its* world from *its* own relative perspective. The critique of Madge (1953) is relevant here.

Knowledge is acquired by combining our sense-experiences, but the form of knowledge is governed by the kinds of presupposition that we are prepared to adopt. It must also be recognized that the process of sense-experiencing is itself very intimately connected with these presuppositions. It is simply not true that our senses provide a set of mechanical instruments by which all relevant aspects of a situation are noted. There are two unanswerable objections to this view. The first is that our individual senses are selective. This alone is an important enough limitation on the completeness of our record, but it must also be recognized that our senses are better than any record of them can be; what we actually experience is an integral reaction, and the more we attempt to analyze this experience into its constituent parts, the more incomplete and atomistic our record becomes (p. xxv, xxvi).

The limitation of perspective holds whether we are discussing observation or the limits of our analysis, i.e., the simplifications which we use in order to "Make our total sensations available to others" (Madge, 1953, p. xxvi).

What is needed in the further development of a research style which is adequately exploratory and confirmatory is that we shift from primary concern with the logic of induction and deduction with its *rules for proper inference* at least long enough to conceive the problem of research methods as a concern for symbolic modes with their various *guides for significant abstraction*. In the field study approach to exploration, the concern to move from particular observations to general theory which is achieved through hypothesis-testing is not far from the

inductive mode of thinking. Though it is recognized that we must limit conclusion-statements to the general populations specified by observed samples, the limitation of the symbolic system for making inferences is that of a caretaker, a cowboy herding collections of facts into their proper classification corrals. In Merton's concern for serendipity, however, we are closer to a concern for the emergence of new pattern by attention to details demanding attention. The limitation of the symbolic system used for exploration/confirmation is that of a view-finder, a filmmaker capturing patterns from a given perspective (now a prairie panorama, now a herd of cattle, now a swirling lasso, now a running calf) and assembling a unified experience. The following brief phrases characterize the nature of the break from an induction/deduction paradigm to an iterative exploration/confirmation paradigm, which capitalizes on its successive approximations to the truth.

Induction/deduction has emphasized static truth arrived at through beginning with "true" premises, whether observational or mathematical. Exploration/confirmation requires emphasis on relational truth, recognizing the limits of both our experience of complexity, sensory or not, and our codifications of that experience, mathematical or not.

Induction/deduction is concerned with a hierarchy of truth from particular to general and presumed to have direct reference and connections along the way. Exploration/confirmation makes cyclical leaps from theoretical to empirical commitment with alternative working hypotheses risked to disconfirmation by "strong inference" (Platt, 1963).

The former begins with the presumably most real and concrete, with what is most consciously definite and clear in our experience,

sensory observation. The latter probes the vague conerescing that presses toward definition, and values both the abstraction of observation and the abstraction of imaginative rationalization.

The former emphasizes confirmation, with inference procedures as a judge to guard against error's entrance. The latter fluctuatingly creates the differences whereby certain elements of our experience are lifted to importance. It values both the attempt to capitalize on exploration and the attempt to capsulize in confirmation.

In the former, the supposed purity of observational data is not permitted the taint of subjectivity of human imagination. For the latter, observation, recognized as already a highly intentional and imaginative limitation, is enhanced by self-conscious creation of difference aimed at intensity of experience.

Thus, in induction/deduction, we have a ladder of truth allowing ascent and descent in a world exhibiting its true relations. Exploration/confirmation is an iterative feedback loop of truth allowing successive adjustment of a given world to a novel possibility.

This, then, summarizes what has been learned from Whitehead regarding the research process. It supports Tukey's concern for "scientific research as a dynamic process" (1966, p. 90). It combines exploration, "seeking what might be relevant," with confirmation, "adjusting optimism and pessimism." It encourages asking the right questions. It recognizes the marvelous functionality of quantitative inquiry procedures, but as "not a high priestess but a handmaiden."

Fortunately, our vision of this iterative process has some ground in actual procedures. The development of multivariate statistics offers a means of abstracting at yet another level, since it is not



limited to treating paired variables. Rather, we can deal with a set of variates, and can test interactions among a set of independent classifiers. Although the dominant use of such procedures is still patterned after the previous use of the univariate descriptive and inferential procedures which were used for induction/deduction, there is increasing awareness that these multivariate procedures provide powerful tools for exploration/confirmation. For instance, for Pruzek (1971, p. 163), flexibly describing the variation in the data is often more important than making formal inference.

The development of the computer as a research tool has greatly facilitated the development of both these multivariate procedures and their flexible application to problems. Borko (1962, 1965) explored the impact which computer applications might have on the development of a methodology unique to the behavioral sciences with their complex, multivariate relations. By manipulating data, researchers could concentrate on the "what if. . .?" questions. Time-sharing technology has stimulated searches for flexible means of interaction of researcher and data providing a further probe toward the iterative process we are discussing here (Morgan and Sonquist, 1963; Press, Rogers, and Shure, 1969). Ball (1965) looks for the day in which each data point can be examined in relation to the data, and not lost in a summary measure, the day in which ". . .it will be possible for the experimental scientist to see on a display the data he is gathering *as he gathers it.*" Anscombe (1973) discusses graphic displays of data. Mosteller & Tukey (1968) express this iterative use of the computer:

Ideally, we should use the computer the way one uses paper and pencil; in short spurts, each use teaching us--numerically, algebraically, or graphically--a bit of what the next use should

be. As we develop the easy back-and-forth interaction between man and computer today being promised by time-sharing systems and remote consoles, we shall move much closer to this ideal (p. 113).

These developments are indicators of the iterative style of exploration/confirmation.

This summary of research as an iterative exploratory/confirmatory process is not without precedent. Whitehead valued both modes of advance, "closure" which is "gathering of detail within assigned pattern," and "penetration" which is "the discovery of novel pattern with its emphasis on novel detail" (MT, p. 80). These are both affirmed by Kuhn (1967) in his analysis of the structures of scientific revolution, in which a basic "paradigm" guides research which is essentially "puzzle solving" until enough pieces that don't fit demand breakthrough into a new paradigm. In the social sciences, despite much puzzle-solving research, it may be doubted whether there is the clarity of a single paradigm or even of a select few paradigms which may be tested by stockpiling measures of central abstractions, such as Newtonian "mass." Much of the measurement in social sciences has been largely classificatory, in spite of its quantitative apparatus. Thus, we must take into account, along with the sophistication of our imaginative tools, the limited state of our empirical and of our theoretical simplification concerning our experienced social reality.

The research style suggested here is a process--observation, imaginative construction, renewed observation. We penetrate our given world by this process in which something is lifted to importance in our imaginative act. We love the data in its complexity and take responsibility for our action of loving it toward greater order and novelty. The shift of attention from an inductive/deductive model to an exploratory/confirmatory model provides an organizing principle for use of available

data analytic tools to penetrate a new problem in a neophyte field. This model of the research macro-process, with its limitations and possibilities, guides the conduct of the investigation whose methods are described in Chapter 3.

#### Religious Education: Theology Enhanced by Imaginative Empiricism

Now we have come full circle. I have identified myself, the investigator, as a religious educator concerned that ministry be both more scientific and more theological. That empirical investigation contributes to the theological task was argued, on the basis of a renewed cosmology which overcomes the limitations of the scientific worldview which banished God from the world and caused an epistemological problem in the need to establish order and connections when knowledge was achieved primarily through a method dependent on sense data, the most novel sort of experience, and that ordered in very specific ways by symbolisms of mathematics. Empirical investigation contributes to an understanding of God by helping to identify his aims at harmony and intensity in the becoming world order. Further, scientific method may be seen as a way of taking human responsibility for enhancing those aims. The way in which this theological vision impinges on the current investigation's statement of problem, choice of theoretical framework, and methodology has been indicated. Finally, a method of quantitative inquiry has been described which is consistent with the needs of a new problem under investigation and with the values of the investigator. Now implications may be drawn for the field of religious education, which has sought to incorporate both scientific and theological inquiry. This ideal has not previously been realized very

well. This is a problem which may be remedied with the more adequate approach to scientific method which has just been outlined.

Though the field of religious education<sup>12</sup> has not become a scientific discipline, it has nevertheless positively evaluated the role of social sciences. Inquiry into reasons for failure of this discipline to appropriate the experimental method brings us close to the concerns of the symbolic interactionists.

Religious education has not developed as its own scientific discipline with its own methods and data. Major reviews of research in religious education (Chave, 1931; Watson, 1931; Snyder, 1950; Clark, 1960, Wycoff, 1966) reveal that experimental research in religious education has been sparse, widely scattered in a few major projects, in some denominational curriculum revision, and in dissertation research. In the journal *Religious Education* reports of research to test hypotheses derived from theory are exceptional and not the norm. The pioneering social philosophy of Coe (1902, 1916, 1929) has remained largely unfulfilled with respect to his hopes for the positive growth of scientific method in direct formulation of religious education practice. Coe (1916) advocated the use of questionnaires, documentary evidence, anthropological investigation, and experiments in the development of a psychology of religion. Though Chave (1931) reported on the development of "Tests and Measurement in Religious Education," quantitative procedures have been generally downplayed since. Snyder (1950) listed research trends "in personality and group life" as foundations for future research in religious education. Phrases characterizing those trends in many ways parallel the concerns articulated by the symbolic interactionists:

---

<sup>12</sup> This assessment of the field of religious education is written from a Protestant perspective.

- 1) study the total personality functioning in realistic situations
- 2) study process
- 3) understand the dynamics, not just a picture of symptoms and external phenomena
- 4) study from within the process as a participant servant
- 5) first set down some hypotheses
- 6) a team attack

Wycoff (1966) referred to a broad range of research methods including theological, historical, biblical, behavioral, social psychological, curricular, and leadership educational. An emphasis on "evaluation," appearing in Wycoff, reflects a discipline whose research concerns are chiefly pragmatic. This wide scope of "methods" in the discipline is one clue to the failure of religious education to develop as an independent scientific discipline. Also, lack of funding support due to separation of church and state, and the lay voluntarism and evangelistic thrust which dominate much of the church's educational institution (Lynn and Wright, 1971) may be other clues. A negative evaluation of experimental research in general is not necessarily reflected.

In fact, there has been a positive evaluation of the role of social sciences. Elliott (1940) documented the liberal religious education movement's appropriation of experimental sciences (education, psychology, sociology, anthropology) not only to improve methods of teaching, but even to help formulate an understanding of man. The work of Coe has already been alluded to. Review volumes edited by Lotz (1950) and Taylor (1960, 1966) contained articles about the contribution of psychology to religious education, and in the 1966 edition, an article on "Sociocultural Foundations" appeared. Snyder (1950) listed frontier areas of experiment which indicate that the field has appropriated research findings on the family, counseling, group dynamics, developmental psychology, and communications.

So the question remains, despite positive evaluation of research findings, why has the discipline as a whole failed to appropriate experimental research methods in developing its own ends? In addition to reasons alluded to above, there may be points where assumptions of the typical religious educator and the typical scientist differ. Clark (1960) ended his review of research with a "footnote" criticizing the determinist philosophy of the researcher, which he called positivism.

In brief this assumes a strict cause and effect relationship between a phenomenon and that which originates it, the originatory being tangible and usually measurable. The positivist emphasizes the point that nature is lawful and therefore completely predictable if all were known, so that free will is ultimately an illusion rather than a fact. For the purposes of research such assumptions often seem necessary, at least in the present state of social science (p. 85).

A trend which has not encouraged the development of an experimental tradition in religious education is the influence of existentialist and neo-orthodox theology. Smith (1941) criticized the liberal religious education movement from the perspective of these "new currents of Christian thought." These involved the revolt against the liberal's optimism regarding human achievement. Science, along with all aspects of culture, was seen as clearly secondary to biblical "revelation." The stress on the transcendence of God, the vision of God as sovereign Lord of history, called attention to the limits of any particular perspective, including theological formulations. Renewed emphasis on man's sinful condition was more in line with the contribution of depth psychology, as in the work of Sherrill (1951, 1955) and Howe (1953), than with experimental psychology. The emphasis on the biblical tradition, along with acceptance of the historico-critical apparatus for determining the interpretation of texts in their sociocultural settings, shifted focus to a broader perspective than that offered by the very present-oriented

experimental tradition. Rootage of the existentialist influence in German Idealism reflected a Kantian world view which stressed a different method for studying the moral law (*Geisteswissenschaften*) than for the natural law (*Naturwissenschaften*). Such a viewpoint tended to accept the scientific method for the natural sciences, but to reject it for any human science. In fact, Coe himself, outspoken advocate that he was for experimental method in religious education, was nurtured in that same Idealist tradition (Coe, 1902, p. 47). His own deep-seated personalism hindered the development of his own social philosophy into a really experimental approach to moral values. Discussing psychology of religion, he criticized some critics of the experimental approach who stressed that there was "something more" to religious experience than the sum of the part processes.

They assume that the "something more" is just another part process co-ordinate with those already recognized by psychology, whereas the missing thing is not another wheel in a machine, or another event in a series, but the individual wholeness of self-realization. (1916, p. 13).

Coe wanted the following human functions included in "functional psychology . . . a psychology of personal self-realizations."

(1) Its distinctive material would be society in the strict sense of this term, that is, persons communicating their desires and purposes to one another, and thereby co-operating with or opposing one another. (2) The focus of attention would be on *mental* functions, that is, action conscious (or becoming conscious) of its own direction and approving (or disapproving) it. . . . (4) Mental content, accordingly, would be treated from the standpoint of the use made of it in the interpretation of life's meaning, and mental mechanism from the standpoint of the purposed control of life. (5) The characteristic special problems would concern the experience of values. . . (1916, p. 31).

Here is the broader empirical reality to which symbolic interactionists have been calling sociological science--societal interaction, reflective consciousness, attention to meaning and purpose, values.

These empirical concerns, which have continued to inform the religious education tradition, have been largely bracketed by the experimental tradition. Thus, the investigator's search for a means of appropriating experimental tradition for religious education is a positive contribution to the symbolic interactionist quest for a more empirical discipline, intentional about its methodological simplifications.

The entire chapter is relevant for the concern of the religious educator that the discipline become more scientific and more theological. Because values affect the entire conduct of empirical inquiry, it is not enough for religious education to appropriate the findings of other disciplines, whether the findings are used merely to enhance teaching methods or to help formulate what it is that should be taught. The asking of the question is often the most important step in the solving of any problem, and the discipline of imaginative empiricism as described here provides one means of enhancing theological inquiry with the methods of empirical investigation. This chapter and the whole investigation upon which it is a perspective provides hope that theologians and scientists may increasingly use one another's disciplines to love the world toward God's aims of harmony and intensity.



## Chapter 3

## RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The investigation methods to be described in Chapter 3 will reflect the methodological rationale for both exploratory and confirmatory lines of action in light of the state of reported research and theory about media influence on marital socialization. The following questions will be answered with sufficient specificity to allow replication and critique. What was the *design* of the investigation? Secondary analysis of survey data was the primary strategy, in a comparative design using multivariate analysis of variance. What was the *sampling* procedure? In addition to the survey procedures, the sample will be described and extrapolated to its applicable populations. What *instrumentation* was used? The primary data was from the Marital Style Inventory, which is discussed along with measurement, validity and reliability. What was the procedure for *data analysis*? Data handling and statistical procedures are described in detail, as well as the model of variable relationships, independent and dependent. How shall we describe the sample with respect to the *marital roles*? with respect to the *socialization agents*? Descriptive data for the six role dimensions and the three classifying agents will be presented at the end of Chapter 3.

## DESIGN

The design of an investigation serves two basic functions: to answer the research question and to control variance (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 300). The answers to the questions are achieved by trying to

maximize systematic variance in the variables of interest, to control extraneous systematic variance, and to minimize error variance. In terms of a symbolic interactionist methodological perspective the design specifies the line of action one takes with respect to an experienced world in order to create the differences whereby certain features of that world are abstracted--lifted to prominence through expression in symbolic form. The limits of these abstractions must be made clear when the design is specified. The salient features of the design for this study which will be clarified in the next paragraphs are the relation of survey and comparative designs to the experimental ideal and secondary analysis. The design to be described here attempts to be flexible enough to probe a new problem area while grounding the investigator's lines of action in commonly accepted paradigms so that the answers to questions may be shared and examined in the scientific community.

#### Survey-Comparative-Experimental Designs

In a survey design where a single sample is assumed, one may apply the linear regression model to indicate the most parsimonious summary of the data points plotted to summarize the relation of two variables, and to indicate the amount of error or deviation which is not explained by the model for the sample. In survey design, deviant or outlying data which do not easily fit the abstracted model may indicate that there are many sub-samples that cannot be adequately represented by the simple, plotted regression line. A logical next step is a comparative design in which sub-samples are identified and compared to one another to see if systematic differences between

sub-groups are significantly greater than the error differences and systemic differences that may be operating within each group. Survey data may be manipulated and organized as a comparative study, with control exercised by the force selection of extreme groups which allows comparison along desired dimensions. Of course, the ideal for which both survey and comparative designs are preparatory is the controlled experiment in which differences are predicted before the experiment and experimental treatments are carefully controlled throughout the investigation. But the experiment assumes that the investigator already has a high degree of sophistication in the identification of variables, in the choice of criterion measures, and in the prediction of outcomes. Such sophistication in confirming hypotheses comes by the kind of probing which can be gained through the exploratory work of careful description of a survey sample, and the identification and comparison of extreme groups which represent sub-samples in the sample survey.

It is surprising that the inter-relation of these various kinds of study has not been more carefully and explicitly delineated in the literature on research design. As early as 1967, Bock argued for use of nonexperimental data, especially in early stages of investigation, in a "comparative study, in which the investigator deliberately sets out to control certain populations or sub-populations." He distinguished the comparative design from "a survey, in which the investigator attempts to describe a single population on the basis of a sample of subjects" (Bock, 1967, p. 6). The interplay of survey, comparative, and experimental designs further enables the symbolic interactionist concern for the full empirical reality at the same time

it makes use of the best abstractive disciplines available. Another trend which further enhances a symbolic interactionist methodology is the increasing use of secondary analysis of survey data for investigatory purposes.

### Secondary Analysis

As early as 1960, Riley (1962) summarized for sociologists the values of secondary analysis of survey data in social science research. This approach to investigation has been greatly amplified and rationalized by Lazarsfeld's method of "elaboration" in the Columbia tradition of social survey research, ably summarized by Hyman (1971). Kish's (1959) analysis of data-dredging techniques is further recognition of the values in secondary analysis of survey data, despite its limitations. It is a commonly accepted practice in social science research, with numerous data archives to preserve data banks for just such purposes.

For this particular investigation, a data base was available which provided a global description of young adult marriages, including significant demographic data. The data was gathered to gain a broadly descriptive, wholistic view of young adult marriage (Compaan, 1973, p. 56), so a wide range of marital roles could be related to one another. Items used in the Marital Style Inventory summarized a wide range of understanding of young adult marriage growing out of research, theory and practice, including specific material on marital roles (Compaan, 1973, p. 23). The sample was large enough to allow a great deal of exploration of variable relationships and comparative subgroupings. Also, the data base was derived in an investigation which stands in the same symbolic interactionist framework (Compaan, 1973,

pp. 56-60) with roles defined as the more flexible "personal roles" rather than the more narrowly defined "social roles." Practically, it was the investigator's previous experience with this data that led to the formulation of the problem of the present study.<sup>1</sup>

Now the salient features of the research design may be summarized, both in review of the rationale just presented and in anticipation of the detailed description of research operations which follows in the next pages. The strategy for confirming the hypotheses-- 1. Media influence marital roles, and 2. They do so in interaction with parents and peers--was to perform secondary analysis of data providing a global picture of young adult marriage. At first, a single-sample survey design merely described the sample with respect to marital roles and socialization agents. But extreme groups of high and low media, parent, and peer influences were selected for a comparative design seeking differential effects of the agent sub-groups on six marital role dimensions. Multivariate analysis of variance in a nonorthogonal, three-way factorial design finally tested for specific interaction effects among parent, peer, and media agents, and identified for each role dimension a variate set which parsimoniously described variations in marital roles attributable to comparative high and low media influence groups.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Hines (1973) summarized this preliminary work on clarifying the sources of learning about and preparation for marriage.

<sup>2</sup> Similar parsimonious models were detected for parent and peer comparative groups and reported to further clarify the media effect.

## SAMPLING

Sampling Procedures and Survey Administration

Due to practical and/or theoretical limits of the original investigation,<sup>3</sup> the sample of Southern California, church-related young married adults reflected the following selection criteria:

- 1) married less than six years; 2) in their first marriage;
- 3) white; 4) both spouses between the ages of 18 and 30;
- 5) legally married; 6) not necessarily active (or even a member) in church or chapel activities; and 7) willing to spend 30-40 minutes in taking the questionnaire (Compaan, 1973, p. 21).

Also, couples were selected with a further criterion in mind, that of supporting the hypothesized existence of an expressive style of marriage. The persons making the final selection of couples comprising the sample had before them this description of the desired type:

The expressive type of marriage which we are hypothesizing to exist among some couples 1) places high value upon the spousal relationship, frequently postponing child birth until later, 2) seeks creative expression by the spouses in things they do and make, 3) works on improving the husband-wife relationship, and 4) has selective associations with relatives and friends on the basis of similar ways of life (Compaan, 1973, p. 247).

Lists of ten (or fewer) couples meeting the above criteria were solicited from each of 291 ministers representing as many churches<sup>4</sup> in twenty communities in the Los Angeles and San Diego areas of Southern

---

<sup>3</sup> The initial investigation was the outcome of the Young Adult Marriage project, Dr. Allen J. Moore, principal investigator, funded by the United States Navy, the United Methodist Board of Education, and the School of Theology Dissertation Funds.

<sup>4</sup> Churches were United Methodist (86), Presbyterian (41), Lutheran (A.L.C. and L.C.A.) (41), American Baptist (40), United Church of Christ (36), Episcopal (30), Disciples of Christ (15), Missing Data (2). These churches were selected by community from area telephone directories, and cross checked with church denomination yearbooks to update and fill in missing pastors' names. Failure of Roman Catholic priests to cooperate in a pretest of sampling method caused their deletion in further sampling (Compaan, 1973, p. 22, 23, 250).

California. They were instructed *not* to obtain prior consent of the couples, since it was felt this would further skew the sample in the direction of those couples with a positive to neutral relation with the minister and would unduly extend the time required to collect the sample (Compaan, 1973, p. 22-23). The sampling method was pretested on pastors in the Burbank, California area, with 28.5% response.<sup>5</sup> The final sample achieved a 45% response of the nearly 300 ministers who were requested to supply lists of couples. This gross sample was reduced to 600 couples by eliminating every fourth couple from an alphabetized list.

1208 questionnaires were mailed to 604 couples in the fall of 1971. Two inventories were mailed to each couple with a stamped self-addressed envelope, a response post-card, and a cover letter explaining the project and requesting their participation. Follow-up letters were sent to non-respondents two weeks after the initial mailing. 530 were returned, a 43.9% response, which was further reduced<sup>6</sup> to 506 (253 couples) for the sample used in the statistical analysis.

Compaan urged (1973, p. 29) that the following factors be taken into consideration along with the 43.9% response rate. For a mailed questionnaire, it required an unusually large amount of time for filling out (30-45 minutes). The only reward was the intrinsic satisfaction of filling out the questionnaire. (It was suggested that couples might like to discuss it with one another, but after they filled it out separately). It involved some specific questions about personal areas

---

<sup>5</sup> The low response rate perhaps reflected interference from summer vacations.

<sup>6</sup> Causes for elimination included responses received after the final cut-off date (8), or because only one spouse responded, or one of the spouses indicated a previous marriage.

of marriage such as sexuality. It required that both spouses be willing to complete the questionnaire before even one would be returned. It could tap painful areas of a couple's marital relationship and those whose marriages were particularly unstable could be assumed to eliminate themselves immediately.<sup>7</sup>

Further information regarding sampling and administration procedures, and documentation of communication with the ministers and couples is found in Compaan (1973).

### Sample Description

The sample may be broadly described in terms of the selection criteria indicated above. It is reiterated that this was not a random sample, but biased toward the expressive style of marriage also described above. The sample description presented is abbreviated; full details may be obtained by consulting Compaan (1973, p. 138ff).

The mean age reported by Compaan was 25.1,<sup>8</sup> thus the sample was slightly weighted toward the upper age group. Thirty percent of the sampled individuals indicated they were students, which may mean as many as one-half the sampled couples were student marriages. Only 3% indicated they were in the military. The majority were married three years or less, with the modal category at 1 to 2 years. The mean income level was \$10,800<sup>9</sup> but the modal categories were at the extremes (under

---

<sup>7</sup> Compaan cited the high rate of divorce in California as making this latter consideration especially significant (1973, p. 29).

<sup>8</sup> Compaan computed the mean from grouped data according to the method of Blalock (1960, p. 61).

<sup>9</sup> Compaan computed the mean from grouped data according to the method of Blalock (1960, p. 61).



\$7,000 and \$14,000 and above), both open categories. Despite the high concentration of students in the sample and the young age range, the sample had a higher mean income than a random sample of the population of the state of California for 1970 (\$9,036).<sup>10</sup> The wife accounted for none of the total income in 28% of the cases; for 1/2 or less in 52% of the cases; and 1/2 or more in 19% of the cases. The sample anticipated an expected mean income rise over the next ten-year period from about \$10,000 to about \$16,000, with 57% expecting an income above \$14,000. Protestants made up 81.6% of the respondents, Roman Catholics 1.8%, Episcopal 3.4%, Jewish .2%, other 4.2% and 8.3% listed no religious preference. About a third of the sample were Methodist, about 10% Presbyterian, another 10% Lutheran, with less than ten per cent each for Baptists, United Church of Christ (including Congregational), Disciples of Christ, or Episcopal. About a third gave no denominational preference. The majority of the sample were raised in a large urban or metropolitan area and none was raised in a rural area. About 3/4 of the sample (70%) were raised in the Pacific Southwest, thus beginning their married life in the region in which they grew up. The majority, (55.8%, had no children, 21.8% had one child, 15.6% had two children, and seven persons had three children but none more than that. The sample was highly educated. Nearly 50% of the sample respondents were college graduates, over half of these (26%) having had some post-college graduate work. Only 11.3% had not had any college work.

---

<sup>10</sup> Cited from Compaan, 1973, p. 143.

### Population

The safest description of the population which the sample characterizes would be to indicate in broad outline the characteristics of the sample and the method used to obtain it. It is a population of white young adult couples, married less than six years, and only once, most of whom have no children. They are between 18 and 30 years of age with most in their mid-twenties. They are enough related to a church that a Protestant minister knows them and would select them as a couple exhibiting an expressive life style. They are highly educated and reflect middle class income and income expectations. They are generally not geographically mobile, most raised and still living in the Pacific Southwest where the sample was drawn. The population likely is comprised of persons with non-conflicted marriages and with a high degree of positive interest in marriage.<sup>11</sup>

There is some justification for a more liberal application of findings from this sample to a wider population. Many social and psychological investigations use college freshmen as their samples, and nearly 90% of the sample had attended at least some college, so the sample shares some of the same limitations of much work which is broadly applied. The white, Protestant (primarily Methodist and Presbyterian), middle class orientation has been often identified with a non-extreme, "middle America" population, and the sample was certainly drawn from that population. Also the conservative bias often associated

---

<sup>11</sup> Compaan indicated this limitation of his sample since the questionnaire took considerable time to fill out and required answers to several potentially threatening questions (1973, p. 36).

with church-related samples may be offset for this sample by the bias toward the expressive life style, hypothesized by Compaan as an emerging trend in young adult marriage and therefore presumably a liberalizing influence in the sample selection. Similarly, the popular association of Southern California with more liberal attitudes may be offset by the general non-mobility of the sample, considered a more conservative influence. A further indication that the sample might be similar to a broader spectrum of young adult marriages in middle class America is the bias toward non-conflicted, "normal" marriages. Most conservatively, the population to which results may be applied is that of young married adults in Southern California, white, middle class, and related to at least in some way with a Protestant minister. Most liberally the sample results may be applied to a population of middle class American young married adults who reflect the middle values of the culture. Of course, the applicability of the findings remains a matter open to further evidence by replication with new samples.

#### INSTRUMENTATION

The instrument, the Marital Style Inventory, was designed by Compaan (1973) to test the hypothesis that an expressive style of marriage exists. Items for the content domain of the survey were selected according to their appropriateness to test for dimensions of the Expressive Type as hypothesized by Compaan.<sup>12</sup> The role

---

<sup>12</sup> The following dimensions of the Expressive Type were operationalized in the Marital Style Inventory: 1) spousal relationship, 2) marriage meaning, 3) sexual relationship, 4) leisure time, 5) family size, 6) kinship relations, 7) vocations, 8) standard of living.

dimensions of the present study, though necessarily extracted from that content domain, are not identical to Compaan's categories. The survey items summarized an extensive literature search as well as practical experiences by Compaan and a support team of persons with experience with young married adults in counseling and educational settings. Five group interviews with couples from Naval bases, church groups, and/or the School of Theology at Claremont were tape recorded and analyzed for insights into young adult marriage and to suggest specific wording of many questionnaire items. A priori, rational selection of the items was successively evaluated and revised first with a group of couples and a class at the School of Theology at Claremont, then on 42 couples selected in a test of the sampling method in Burbank, California (with a 55% sample return), then again with School of Theology couples. Revision achieved "better distribution of answers" and "greater uniformity of question types" (Compaan, 1973, p. 25). The final form of the instrument is presented in Appendix A.

### Measurement

Most inventory items were Likert-type, using 6-point summated rating scales. This study did not use the summation aspect reported by Compaan (1973, p. 30, 31), but used raw data for analyses. Primary concern was not to construct scales along specified dimensions, but to describe carefully the variation found in the data. The use made of the variables for this study stayed close to the literal meaning of each questionnaire item, although there was considerable overlap among items. A major number of attitude items involved responses of varying degrees of agreement or disagreement. The variate sets were largely drawn from these items. Other items were forced choice scales, none

ranging more than nine options and most only six or seven. Some items (e.g., sex, and #163) were dichotomous variables. These dichotomous variables dominated the exploratory phases, but in latter stages of the investigation, even these were assumed to be equal interval scale (ranging from "0" to "1"). The results of treating these dichotomous variables in product-moment correlations do not figure in the confirmatory model, thus they become merely one more way of describing data, allowing even these dichotomous variables to be seen in relation to other variables, more suited to correlation procedures, which were included in the model.

#### Validity and Reliability

No statistical tests of validity or reliability have been made. Such tests would be worthy projects in their own right, requiring further investigation at a later date. Compaan (1973, p. 38) reported that in accordance with procedures suggested by the American Psychological Association (*Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests and Manuals*, Washington, 1966, p. 15), he submitted the items of the test instrument to a group of experts who fall within the sample distribution. These persons, graduate students specializing in the study of life styles, all aged 18-30, critically examined the items to determine whether they accurately portrayed current young adult marital styles and whether the hypothesized dimensions of the expressive style were adequately discriminated. Also three professors intimately acquainted with young adult life styles also examined the item-pool. The pre-testing and revision procedures and the grounding in both literature and discussion groups all helped to provide validity. Since the present

study was not primarily concerned with testing a theoretical construct, there is no need for concern with construct validity. The confirmatory aspects grew out of exploratory work providing a base for selection of those items which seemed most useful for further analysis. Reliability was indicated in the high correlations among the dimensions tested. Some of these correlations are reported in Chapter 4.

## ANALYSIS

### Data Handling and Statistics

Data was keypunched directly from questionnaires and verified. The reversal of some items in coding reported by Compaan does not apply to this set, since raw data was used for all reported analyses. Appendix B indicates the record definition, including the code names which are used throughout this report to refer to questionnaire items.

The raw data for the base of 506 observations (253 couples) was organized in SPSS format (Nie, Bent, and Hull, 1970) for access via the Claremont Graduate School Novar terminal to the PDP-10 timesharing facility of the Seaver Computer Network (Pomona College). Exploratory phases were computed on this system to allow for maximal flexibility of data manipulation. Statistics were computed in accordance with procedures of SPSS, using the CROSSTABS program for Chi Square Analysis, and CODEBOOK for descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, standard error, median, mode, range, skew, kurtosis) and for graphic presentation of frequency distributions. Due to an investigator oversight the descriptive statistics for the 506 observations did not remove blank observations as "missing observations," therefore these are counted in the program as "0." This should be noted in dealing

with the means and standard deviations, although substantial error is not expected since the sample is large (n=506) and missing observations are few (maximum of 13). Cell means reported in confirmatory results were accurate based on a cleaned-up data deck of 321 observations.

A card sorter was used to remove missing information, thus the remaining set of 321 does not necessarily include both spouses of a couple. For confirmatory aspects, MANOVA<sup>13</sup> program was used with 112 bytes of core available on the Seaver Center IBM 360. Though there was some experimentation with difference contrasts for trend analysis, primarily simple deviation contrasts were used giving an indication of significant deviations from the grand mean totalled across cells. Graphic indication of cell means was used to clarify trends. F statistics indicated whether the total amount of cell mean deviation from the grand mean was significant.

### Procedures

Initial exploration to seek adequate means of classification was performed in the following manner. Descriptive statistics provided background information on the variables of interest, with frequency distributions graphically presented for examination. These statistics characterized an assumed single-sample survey with respect to the variables of interest (marital roles and socialization agents). But comparative groups were sought, allowing contrast of high and low groups of media, parent, and peer influences. The search for means of classifying the "influence" variables involved the following strategies.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Multivariate Analysis of Variance* (MANOVA) is a university of Miami Biometric Laboratory Program modified and prepared for the Claremont Graduate School by Forest Harrison, T.H. Bleakney, & Michael Parker.

First, cross tabulations (with Chi Square Analysis to determine significance) were based on responses to item #163,<sup>14</sup> "Check any of the following which were influential in your learning about and preparation for marriage: books, magazines, television, relatives, parents, dating, friendships, premarital counseling by a minister, marriage and family course, living on one's own, other." The three media items (books, magazines, television), the parent item and the two peer items (dating, friendships) were selected for this cross tabulation process. These analyses produced tables relating these dichotomous variables to all the pool of variables representing socialization agents, and some of the pool representing socialization agents, and some of the pool representing role dimensions.<sup>15</sup> Most relationships with a Chi Square significant at  $p < .250$  were charted for examination as frequency distributions comparing those who did and those who did not check the particular influence (e.g., books, parents, dating).

The results of these analyses were confounded by the fact that persons could check more than one item and therefore, the information contained in each of the responses was not pure. In order to further clarify the relationships of each of these PR items (the label used for items in #163, regarding PReparation for marriage), descriptive

---

<sup>14</sup> The dichotomous measures of response (1) vs. non-response (0), do not provide much variance on which to base firm statistical findings. Also, confounding response set effects are noted. But the question is sharply focused on the substantive issue, "learning about and preparation for marriage."

<sup>15</sup> Tested in the preliminary phases of the investigation were the NT variables (nos. 119-136), the MP variables (nos. 75-88), the DS variables (nos. 110-114), and a few selected variables representing predominantly the emphasis on the spousal companionship role (nos. 2, 9, 16, 32, 39, 44, 53, 68, 90, 96-99).



statistics on these items were drawn for nine samples, taking into account the total number of responses on #163 for a given observation. Using the criterion, "select if PRBOOKS + PRMAG + . . . PRCOURSE + PRLIVING = 1," then "select if PRBOOKS + PRMAG + . . . PRCOURSE + PRLIVING = 2" (and so on to 9), we found which variables were checked most at each number of check marks made by a person. Based on this data, further isolation of variables of interest was achieved through the selection of those observations which did not even check the "popular" responses--parents, dating, and/or friendships--as influential even though they had already checked at least five other influence sources. Also isolated were those who selected the less "popular" responses--books, magazines, and/or television--as one of only three or fewer responses (four or fewer for TV). Differences among media and between the two peer measures on this question were further tested by the creation of two new variables: PRMEDIA, which allowed cross tabulations comparing persons who checked no media, only one medium or another, or various combinations of two media, and persons who checked all three media responses on item #163, and FRENDATE, which allowed comparison of persons who checked neither dating nor friendships, those who checked only one or the other, and those who checked both.

In addition to the above explorations using cross tabulation, pair-wise product moment correlations were computed for all relevant variables and examined.<sup>16</sup> Some of the more significant of these

---

<sup>16</sup> All variables were computed if they were included in the investigation. However, those figuring most prominently in the exploratory aspects of the investigation were primarily the correlations among the pool of independent variables or socialization agents, and the few selected variates indicated in footnote 15 on p.162.

correlations were presented graphically for examination. Since the sample was so large, major focus was on the measure of association obtained by squaring the correlation coefficient ( $r^2$ ). Generally, relationships were not considered very useful unless  $r \geq .200$ , although most relationships where  $p < .009$  were examined. Findings from the above explorations into relations of variables representing socialization agents are reported below in Chapter 4.

The search for a means of classification also led to some experimental additive combination of certain parent and peer variables in order to achieve indexes which would be used to select high and low influence groups. These indexes were abandoned because of loss of information entailed by combining unique variables and the attendant difficulty of specifying the complexity of the indexed dimension. Also, some attempts to classify by selecting out extreme groups on relevant variables were tried (e.g., if  $PRNTREL \geq 5$ , assign in high parent and if  $PRNTREL \leq 3$ , assign in low parent). For this selection strategy it would have been easier than the index approach to specify exactly who was included in which classification, but the reductions generally resulted in too low an  $n$  for three-way factorial design, and these classifications were also abandoned. The decision was made to select three particular variables to represent the media, peer, and parent dimensions. These were selected on both substantive and statistical grounds. (Is it relevant to the problem? Does it maximize variance? Is it highly related to other variables in the same dimension? etc.). The explicit argument for the particular variables chosen as classifiers ( $MOVIESED$ ,  $PRNTREL$ ,  $FRENDTIM$ ) is given at the end of Chapter 4.

For the 3-way confirmatory analysis, the following procedures

were used in order to trim the six role dimensions (Companionate, Economic, Leisure, Marital, Parental, Sexual) to that group of variates for each dimension which most parsimoniously explained the variance attributable to the classifiers.

1. For each broad role dimension, those variates were sorted out which contributed the most variance in each classifier used as a one-way model. These were done in groupings with the variables in each role dimension used as variates in 1-way classifications (for MOVIESED, PRNTREL, and FRENDTIM or M-, P-, F-ways). Significance levels ( $p$ ) attached to the univariate  $F$ 's were used as a rough guide in searching for the variate set which would maximize the multivariate  $F$  and the  $R$ . The selection was broad and liberal and depended on the total number of significant or non-significant results. If eight or ten variates indicated univariate  $F$  tests yielding  $p < .001$  (e.g., as in the Marital dimension) then a fairly significant variate (e.g., WOMNFREE,  $p < .023$ ) was not included. On the other hand, some variates where  $p < .20$  might be included if few others were significant and they provided a significant multivariate  $F$  in combination.

2. In a nonorthogonal 3-way factorial model combining FPM and then in all combinations of 2-way interactions among F, P, and M, variates were identified which had to be explained in terms of interactions. The 3-way model had to be chosen so as to minimize missing cells (27 non-vacant cells), and to maximize the number of cells (48), distribution of those cells, and the total  $n$  (52).<sup>17</sup> Again, the

---

<sup>17</sup> MOVIESED, M-way, 6 possible cells, used only cells 2,3,5,6.  
 PRNTREL, P-way, 7 possible cells, used only cells 3,5,7.  
 FRENDTIM, F-way, 6 possible cells, used only cells 1,3,4,6.

univariate F tests were used liberally to select those items which maximized the multivariate F and R for the interactions. Those which were significant (univariate F) in interactions at  $p < .01$  were removed from further consideration in the 1-way models. The report on interactions (Chapter 5, p. 250) notes those variates which were significant  $p < .05$  and which in combinations provided interactions with multivariate F significant as well.

3. Finally, a trimmed set of variates for each 1-way model for each role dimension was arrived at through deletion of interactions and by further trimming, using standardized discriminant function coefficients to sort out variates that contributed little to the overall variance as indicated in the multivariate F and the multiple R. For the most part variates with univariate F with  $p < .05$  were deleted from the parsimonious model, although they were retained in some instances if multiple criteria demanded that the variate stay in the set, (e.g., an extremely significant multivariate F and the discriminant function coefficient indicating that the variate made a major contribution to the explanatory model).

Certain systematic effects attributable to non-research sources of variation have been identified and their effects removed through the analysis of covariance. Though this has not yet been achieved systematically, preliminary findings are presented in order to indicate some other factors that influence marital roles.

### Statistical Model

The following model was used to test the hypotheses:

- 1) Media influence marital roles.
- 2) They do so in interaction with parents and peers.

The use of the terms independent, dependent, and covariate reflect the investigator's choice, based on the hypotheses and relations to be tested. Exploratory phases were designed to include the most information possible and confirmatory phases were designed to trim this information to its bare essentials, to sacrifice as much information as possible without appreciably losing explanatory power.

The *independent variables* were the socialization agents: media, parents, and peers. The pool of MSI questions reflecting these dimensions is reported in Appendix C. Exploratory investigation of this pool allowed selection of three classifiers--MOVIESED, PRNTREL, and FRENDTIM. The items in the pool included simple responses to question #163, "Check those items which have been influential in your learning about and preparation for marriage," supplemented by reports of behavior (e.g., movie attendance, books and magazine articles read on sex and marriage, number of visits with friends, contacts with parents by phone or letter or in person, received financial aid from parents), and certain attitudes (e.g., "Contemporary movies have been an education for our marriage." "Most of our friends have the same lifestyle we do." "Being free and independent from parents" is judged important. "Our parents are closer than friends our own age. "). These relatively limited items nevertheless provided a basis for classification so that their influence on roles and their interrelations with one another could be tested. Intercorrelations within the sets (media, parents, peers) indicated that items did refer to one another, but each particular question must be interpreted in light of the wording of the question itself.

*Dependent variables* were the role dimensions: companionate,

economic, leisure, marital, parental, sexual. The pool of questionnaire items was divided into these six role dimensions, which are closely akin, but not identical to the items of the various dimensions of the expressive style of Compaan (see 12, p. 157). Most of the items for these dimensions were attitude items, although some referred to reported behaviors. See Appendix C for identification of the items in each role dimension. These role dimensions were treated throughout as though they were independent of one another. Further investigation is needed to assess more carefully their relations to one another. The information derived from the multiple R and the multivariate F statistics allowed comparison of the relative amount of variance accounted for in each role dimension. However, the explication of these roles and their interrelations was not the purpose of this study. Rather, role dimensions were primarily used as the criteria of media influence in relation to other socialization agents. Nevertheless, because of the broad range of role prescriptions available in the MSI pool of items, confirmation *that* media influence marital roles points to further exploration guided by *what* roles are influenced and by *what* agents.

Demographic factors and other socialization agents also account for variation in these roles, and must be seen in relation to our main effects. These must be accounted for in the sample description (see Appendix C). Wherever such factors are discussed in this study, they are treated as covariates whose effects may be removed through analysis of covariance.

To review the hypotheses in relation to the model:

1. *Media influence marital roles.* This was indicated through reporting effects of MOVIESED (in 1-way classification) upon the various

role dimensions after interaction effects were removed. Similarly, effects (1-way, interaction effects removed) of PRNTREL and FRENDTIM were used for comparison and contrast.

2. *Media influence interacts with that of parents and peers.*

In addition to contrasts noted above by comparing the 1-way parsimonious models, there were interactions among effects which are reported for a 2-way model (MP, MF) or a 3-way model (MPF). Variance in these roles must be accounted for by reference to combinations of media, parent, and/or peer influence.

#### DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON ROLES

The following description of role dimensions assumes reference to the summarized descriptive data in Appendix D. The following verbal descriptions minimize statistical apparatus within the text. The questions representing each role dimension are presented here in their exact wording, since little abstraction from these actual variables is intended. In subsequent discussion the variable code names are generally used. Each role dimension is presented first as a verbal summary of the central tendencies, the mean responses of "the sample" abstractly treated as a homogeneous unit. Then, indicators of spread (variance, frequency distributions) describe any variables of interest because they express unusually strong agreement or disagreement, or ambivalence. This description indicates how much variability has been sacrificed in the previous simple description of the sample. Finally, each role dimension is summarized verbally by joint reference to the descriptive data and to the role positions and prescriptions identified

on p.63ff of Chapter 1.<sup>18</sup>

### Sexual Roles

Generally our sample was at ease with sex. They strongly disagreed that "Sex is most difficult to talk about" (HARDTALK), and mildly disagreed that "People who think too much about sex are immature" (IMMATURE). In comparing their attitudes about sex (ATTSEX) "with those of most people" they considered themselves slightly more liberal. They valued sex highly but saw it as having its place in relation to other values. For example, they only mildly agreed that "Sexual communication is the deepest and most important communication between spouses" (SEXCOMM), and they mildly disagreed that "The sexual relationship is the most significant part of a marriage" (SEXMOST). They were undecided whether "Improving our sexual relationship is a primary goal in our marriage" (MPROVSEX). The playful aspects of sexual expression were strongly emphasized. They strongly agreed, "I hope to continually make intercourse more enjoyable" (MAKENJOY), and "sexual playing together" (MPSXPLAY) was judged very important. They strongly agreed that "Playing together is an (sic) important in sex as reaching a climax" (PLAYING), although they were undecided whether "Sexual foreplay is more enjoyable than is the climax" (FOREPLAY). They strongly agreed that "Sex, like food, is more enjoyable when you have variety with your spouse" (VARIETY) and strongly agreed that "A couple ought to be free to

---

<sup>18</sup> Since the definition of these role dimensions in terms of position and prescriptions is a post hoc characterization in order to adapt available data for a particular theoretical framework, these loose role prescriptions are not used to organize the main presentation of the descriptive data.



experiment sexually in their marriage" (XPERIMNT). Despite the high valuation placed on these playful aspects of the sexual relationship, the sample only mildly agreed that "Sex is primarily fun" (SEXISFUN). Though there was mild agreement that, "Sexual intercourse is a sacred act" (SACRDACT), there was mild to strong disagreement that "Sexual expression is basically a procreative act" (PROCREAT).

Certain reported behaviors relate to this dimension. "How often in the last month have you talked openly with your spouse about your sexual relationship and its meaning for you?" (FSEXTALK) resulted in a mean response between 1-2 times and 3-4 times.

Respondents estimated a moderate extent of discussion of "your sexual desires and expressions with your spouse" (DSSXDES), but they had not discussed "sexual fantasies" (DSSXFANT) nearly as much. To the question, "During the last few months how often have you had intercourse?" (COITFREQ), the mean response was between "3 or 4 times a week" and "once or twice a week." "On the average how much time do you spend in sexual activity, including all sexually stimulating activities immediately prior to and following intercourse?" (SEXTIME) was between 30 and 45 minutes. And the "longest time that you have spent in sexual activity" (MAXSXTIM) elicited a mean response of "1-1/2 to 2 hours."

There were indications of unusually high agreement on the playful aspects of sexuality. The four of the 21 sex role variables which reflected the least variance were: MPSXPLAY, PLAYING, MAKENJOY, and XPERIMNT. This unusually high agreement was also indicated by the strongly skewed distributions of items related to play and enjoyment of sex. The skew is reflected in the following comparisons of the

single extreme category, "very strongly agree" with all three "disagree" categories:

XPÉRIMNT--51% very strongly agree, only 2% disagree;  
 MAKENJOY--45% very strongly agree, only 3% disagree;  
 PLAYING-- 38% very strongly agree, only 4% disagree;  
 VARIETY-- 29% very strongly agree, only 8% disagree.

Further, in response to MPSXPLAY, 77% were at the two positive extremes ("very" or "extremely important") while only 23% were in the remaining four categories ("moderately" to "not important at all"). While the playful dimension of sexuality was strongly affirmed, there was nearly equally strong rejection of the notion that sex is difficult to talk about, or primarily procreative. Again, the one extreme category may be compared with its opposite 3 categories:

HARDTALK--41% very strongly disagree, only 14% agree;  
 PROCREAT--33% very strongly disagree, only 22% agree.

PROCREAT was one of the five (of 21) variables reflecting the greatest amount of variance, indicating a significant divergence of opinion despite the above-indicated skew to strong disagreement. Other items in this high variance group were SACRDACT, FSEXTALK, MAXSXTIM, DSSXFANT. The considerable spread demonstrated by SACRDACT<sup>19</sup> may indicate either diversity of opinion or ambiguity regarding the meaning of the statement. For the items FSEXTALK<sup>20</sup> and MAXSXTIM<sup>21</sup> deviation from a normal

|               |          |                          | Agree    |          |        | Disagree |          |           |
|---------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|----------|--------|----------|----------|-----------|
| <sup>19</sup> | SACRDACT | missing<br>response data | very     | strongly | mildly | mildly   | strongly | very      |
|               |          |                          | strongly | strongly | mildly | mildly   | strongly | strongly  |
|               | %        | 0.4                      | 19.2     | 18       | 21.5   | 18.4     | 11.1     | 11.1      |
| <sup>20</sup> | FSEXTALK | missing<br>response data | not at   | 1-2      | 3-4    | 5-6      | 7-8      | 9 or more |
|               |          |                          | all      | times    | times  | times    | times    | times     |
|               | %        | 1.6                      | 16.4     | 34.8     | 21.7   | 9.3      | 4.3      | 11.9      |
| <sup>21</sup> | MAXSXTIM | missing<br>response data | 30 min.  | 30 min.  | 1-1.5  | 1.5-2    | 2-3      | more than |
|               |          |                          | or less  | - 1 hr.  | hours  | hours    | hours    | 3 hrs.    |
|               | %        | 1.2                      | 3.2      | 18.2     | 24.1   | 18.6     | 13.6     | 21.1      |

curve at the extreme upper end of each distribution may indicate a deviant sub-sample.

In summary, regarding the expectation that sex is itself a means of communication which may be openly communicated about, the sample did not find sex difficult to talk about, nor did it judge thinking too much about sex as immature, but sexual desires with one's spouse were much more talked about than were one's sexual fantasies. There was only mild agreement that sexual communication is the most important sharing between spouses. A deviant group may perhaps be isolated which has discussed the meaning of sex to an unusual extent and for whom the longest reported time spent in sexual activity was unusually high. Regarding the expectation that sex is valued and worked at, the sample did work at making sexual intercourse more enjoyable, but improving their sexual relationship was not a primary goal for marriage and they disagreed that the sexual relationship is the most significant part of a marriage. The expectation that sexual expression is highly playful was strongly affirmed by many variables, such as the interest in variety, experimentation, and sexual foreplay. But there was only mild agreement that sex is primarily fun. There was considerable divergence of opinion whether sexual intercourse is a sacred act and whether it is basically procreative, though procreation was generally rejected as the basic purpose.

### Marital Roles

The variables in the marital role dimension focus on the meaning of marriage including the forms it should take, and its relation to the personal needs of the spouses and the social sanctions of the society. The couples in the sample have discussed to a great extent, "the meaning

(DSMARIGE), and 58.5% answered yes to the question, "If you had the opportunity to be involved in some discussion of the first years of marriage with other couples your age, would you be interested?"

(DISCUSS). The sample mildly disagreed that "New forms of marriage are required today" (NEWFORMS), mildly to strongly disagreed that "A five year renewable contract would be a possible base for a marriage" (FIVEYEAR), and strongly disagreed that "Marriage, at least the first one, can be a trial relationship in which to mature a little" (TRIALREL). They were undecided whether "Marriage is a love relationship that does not require a legal contract" (LOVVSLEG), though they strongly disagreed that "Marriage is first of all a legal contract" (CONTRACT). They mildly disagreed that "Marriage does not require a wedding" (NOWEDDNG), and that "Living together before marriage is an important way to find out if marriage will work" (LIVTOGB4). They considered themselves generally more conservative in comparison with most people in their attitudes about "Divorce" (ATTDIVOR), and mildly to strongly disagreed that "Divorce sometime in one's life is to be expected today" (DIVORCE). They did, however, mildly agree that "Marriage is only valid as long as it meets the needs of both spouses" (MEETNEED), though they mildly disagreed that "The primary function of marriage is to increase my personal fulfillment" (PRSNFILL). They strongly to very strongly agreed that "Personal growth and change is essential in marriage" (PRSNGROW), and strongly agreed that "A woman should have as much freedom in a marriage as a man" (WOMNFREE).

Unusually high agreement was exhibited on WOMNFREE and PRSNGROW, as indicated by the extremely low variance on these variables and the number who very strongly agreed (1 category) as contrasted with all

those who disagreed (3 categories):

PRSNNGROW--53% very strongly agree, only 1% disagree;  
WOMNFREE--43% very strongly agree, only 10% disagree.

Several variables indicating disagreement had strongly skewed distributions. Table 3.1 presents the frequency distributions for marital role variables selected because of their high degree of skew or their demonstration of spread or bimodality. This helps to see the variations within the dimension on the questions which generally deal with the meaning of the forms and functions of marriage. They are arranged in order of descending means, indicating as one moves down the table, less disagreement and more ambivalence regarding the variate. There was little agreement that marriage is first of all a legal contract nor that marriage is merely a trial relationship. The number who agree is more and the degrees of disagreement are moderated for FIVEYEAR and DIVORCE. NEWFORMS, placed in the middle of the table for comparative purposes, indicates a shift in the mode to "mildly agree" with considerable spread among the "disagree" categories. The last four variables on the table exhibited the most variance of any of the 14 marital variables.

Table 3.1  
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS: SELECTED<sup>1</sup> MARITAL ROLE VARIABLES

|          |     | <u>Missing Data</u> | <u>V.S.A.</u> | <u>S.A.</u> | <u>M.A.</u> | <u>M.D.</u> | <u>S.D.</u> | <u>V.S.D.</u> |
|----------|-----|---------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| CONTRACT | %'s | 1.6                 | 4.5           | 3.8         | 7.7         | 18.8        | 26.9        | 36.8          |
| TRIALREL |     | 1.6                 | 1.8           | 3.8         | 11.3        | 11.9        | 28.3        | 41.5          |
| FIVEYEAR |     | 0.8                 | 2.8           | 5.5         | 16.8        | 17.2        | 21.9        | 35.0          |
| DIVORCE  |     | 1.2                 | 1.0           | 2.8         | 15.8        | 25.7        | 29.4        | 24.1          |
| NEWFORMS |     | 0.4                 | 4.9           | 12.1        | 26.1        | 20.6        | 20.6        | 15.4          |
| LIVTOGB4 |     | 2.2                 | 7.5           | 11.5        | 23.7        | 17.2        | 15.8        | 22.1          |
| NOWEDDNG |     | 0.2                 | 11.9          | 14.8        | 21.7        | 18.2        | 14.2        | 19.0          |
| LOVVSLEG |     | 0.0                 | 11.7          | 19.2        | 20.0        | 16.2        | 14.8        | 18.2          |
| MEETNEED |     | 2.2                 | 13.6          | 20.2        | 24.3        | 15.2        | 14.2        | 10.3          |

<sup>1</sup> Selection criterion was high degree of skew or spread.

The ambivalence of the sample on LIVTOGB4, NOWEDDNG, and LOVVSLEG is demonstrated by the bimodality evident in comparing the "mildly agree" and the "very strongly disagree" categories. There was considerable spread and a relatively flat distribution for all of these variables, including MEETNEED. The ambivalence was especially pronounced for LOVVSLEG (50.8% agree, 49.2% disagree).

To summarize the marital role expectations of the sample, there was a strong expectation that marriage is a life-long commitment. Marriage as a trial relationship or a five year renewable contract was strongly rejected, and divorce was not considered normative. But there was some expectation that marriage may take a variety of forms. Though there was more disagreement than agreement that new forms of marriage are required and though at least two "new forms" were generally rejected (TRIALREL, FIVEYEAR), there was much divergence of opinion about certain aspects of the marital dimension, perhaps due to the contrasting demands of personal fulfillment and social sanctions. There was strong evidence that the sample did not conceive marriage primarily in terms of a legal contract. A sizable minority agreed that marriage does not require a wedding, that it is a love relationship and does not require a legal contract, and that living together before marriage is a good way to test the relationship. But there was still an expectation that marriage requires some legal sanction as evidenced by disagreement with all alternatives to the normative marriage, and the number who were reluctant to agree that marriage does not *require* a legal contract despite the near unanimous feeling that marriage is not *primarily* a legal contract. That the personal fulfillment dimension may be another factor in the divergent opinions regarding marital roles was

evidenced by the mild agreement that marriage is only valid as long as it meets the needs of both spouses, agreement that personal growth and development are necessary to marriage, and that a woman should be as free as a man. However, to increase personal fulfillment was not strongly considered the primary function of a marriage. In short, the role expectations regarding the life-long commitment of the spousal relationship was strongly affirmed. But conflicting demands of personal fulfillment and social sanction brought pressures to bear that created real divergence of opinion regarding some of the social expectations attached to the marital role.

#### Companionate Roles

The sample of young married adults was strongly focused on the companionate aspects of their marriage. They more than strongly agreed that "I prefer to be with my spouse, rather than my very good friends or family" (PREFSPOU). They considered as highly important "spending my free time with my spouse" (MPFRETIM). They foresaw extension of that companionship and strongly agreed that "I look forward to a few years with my spouse after the children are out of the home" (POSTKIDS). The companionship is further reflected in the overall communicativeness of the spouses. They were very highly interested in "talking with your spouse about anything or everything" (NTTALK), an interest borne out in a reported average between 12 and 15 hours per week spent talking with their spouse, three-eighths of the sample indicating 18 hours or more (TALKTIME). They more than strongly agreed that "Communication is the basis of a marriage" (COMMBASI). Beyond this general focus, however, there was a tendency to focus much of the communication in the marriage

back on the relationship itself to facilitate the couple's further growth. They were very highly interested in "Talk sessions with spouse aimed at improving your relationship" (NTTLKIMP), and they considered very important "My spouse's helping me to grow" (MPHLPGRO). They strongly agreed that "Communication is more open in our marriage than it was in my parent's (sic)" (OPENCOMM), and that "Expressing anger is as important as expressing love in marriage" (XPRSANGR). They reported only moderate discussion of "Dissatisfactions with your relationship" (DSDISSAT). The communication includes intimate personal sharing. For instance, they strongly agreed that "My spouse is the first to know about the painful experiences I have" (FRSTTONO). They strongly agreed that "I feel that my spouse does talk freely with me about his/her most intimate thoughts and feelings" (SINTMATE), and even more strongly agreed that "I feel that I can talk freely with my spouse about my most intimate thoughts and feelings" (IINTMATE). Though they reported considerable discussion of "doubts and hopes for life" (DSDOUBTS), they reported only moderate discussion of "dreams you have had" (DSDREAMS), and of "difficult experiences in childhood" (DSDIFEXP), and less discussion of "Dislikes about your parents' marital relationship" (DSDISLIK).

The considerable consensus on the companionate roles is indicated by the fact that nearly all responses to these items were *strongly* positive (i.e., toward affirmation of the companionate dimension.) The allowable response range for each of these variables was from 1 to 6 (1 being positive except for TALKTIME). For 10 of the 18 variables in this dimension, only 10% of the sample or less score in categories 4 through 6 (more disagreement, or less interest, or less discussion, or less importance). The 5 variables exhibiting the least variance in



this dimension--MPHLPGR0, PREFSPOU, COMMBASI, MPFRETIM, NTTALK--only had scores in the first 4 or 5 categories of the possible range of 6 and the combined frequencies of responses "4" through "4" + "5" + "6" included only 5% of the sample or less.<sup>22</sup> In contrast, unusually high variance was exhibited for DSDISLIK, DSDIFEXP, DSDISSAT, and TALKTIME. Considerable spread was exhibited by the frequency distributions for DSDIFEXP and DSDISSAT.<sup>23</sup> DSDISLIK also demonstrated considerable spread despite the large percentage at "no" discussion of dislikes about parents' marital relation.

Briefly to characterize the sample with regard to role expectations, there was a strong affirmation of the companionate role. This was exhibited by preference to spend time with the spouse and the anticipation that the companionship would be enjoyed even after one's children have left home. A great deal of communication was expected, including much time talking with one's spouse. There was a strong expectation that spouse communication should improve the marital relationship and facilitate the growth of each spouse. The sampled couples considered their communication more open than that of their parents, strongly affirming freedom to express anger as well as love. There was

---

<sup>22</sup> Further evidence of the importance attached to the companionate dimension was that the 3 lowest of the 18 means indicating ratings of interest (MSI #'s 119-136) were NTTALK, NTDINOUT ("dining out with your spouse"), and NTTLKIMP.

<sup>23</sup> Extent of discussion with spouse:

|           |    | extensive |      |      | -    |      |      | no   |  |
|-----------|----|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
|           |    | Missing   | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |  |
| DSDIFEXP: | %s | .4        | 13.8 | 17.8 | 21.5 | 17.4 | 18.8 | 10.3 |  |
| DSDISSAT: |    | .4        | 11.9 | 16.0 | 22.5 | 17.0 | 20.2 | 12.1 |  |
| DSDISLIK: |    | 1.4       | 8.9  | 14.0 | 16.0 | 12.3 | 15.8 | 31.6 |  |

not much discussion, however, of dissatisfactions in their marital relationship. Though a great deal of personal sharing was expected, including the sharing of painful experiences, doubts and hopes for life, and one's most intimate thoughts and feelings, this expectation was realized by only moderate discussion of dreams, difficult childhood experiences, or dislikes about one's parents' marital relationship.

### Parental Roles

The sample strongly affirmed the parental role, but indicated some ambivalence about this dimension, especially in contrast to the sample's strong focus on companionship. They strongly agreed that "Of first importance in marriage is the husband-wife relationship" (HUSBWIFE), but only mildly agreed that "Being a good husband or wife is more important than being a good father or mother" (WIFEMOTH). And the sample was undecided (49% agreed, 51% disagreed) whether "Raising a family is the basic focus of marriage" (FAMFOCUS). The sample considered themselves slightly more conservative than most people in their attitude about "the feminist movement" (ATTFEM).<sup>24</sup> Despite the ambiguity regarding how much the marriage should focus on raising a family, the sample judged as very important "the chance to have children" (MPCHILDR). But having children was an option about which one exercised some choice including the kind of experience one wanted child bearing to be. They reported considerable discussion of "when to have children" (DSWHNKID), felt themselves to be slightly more liberal than others in

---

<sup>24</sup> 21.1% considered themselves more liberal, 32% about the same, 46.4% more conservative than others in their attitude toward the feminist movement.

their attitude toward abortion (ATTABORT),<sup>25</sup> and mildly agreed that "Natural childbirth is a more rewarding method of childbirth" (NATUBRTH). The sample also exercised choice about family size. They mildly to strongly agreed that "The population crisis is an important factor in my decision regarding family size" (POPUCRIS), mildly agreed that "Adoption of children should be considered after one has two children" (ADOPTKID), and mildly agreed that "Two children is just the right number for a happy family" (TWOCHILD). The two-child norm was reflected in the number of children wanted (KIDSWANT) "by birth and/or adoption"--58.7% wanted two, only 5% wanted less than two, and 33.2% wanted more than two. There was attention given already in the sample (of whom 55.1% had no children) to the problem of child rearing. They reported even more discussion of "How to raise your children" (DSRASKID) than they did for DSWHNKID, and mildly agreed that "Raising the children properly is the biggest task in marriage" (RAISKIDS). They mildly agreed that "Breast feeding a baby is better than bottle feeding" (BRESTFED). And they considered very to extremely important "being able to give a good education to my children" (MPEDUCAT),<sup>26</sup> no doubt a reflection of the highly educated sample.

The least variance for the 16 variables in this dimension was found on MPEDUCAT (on which 47% very strongly agreed, while only 2% disagreed in any way), HUSBWIFE (59% very strongly agreed, and only 2% disagreed), and KIDSWANT. Variables whose distributions were strongly

---

<sup>25</sup> 59.7% considered themselves more liberal, 13.6% about the same, 25.9% more conservative than others in attitude on abortion.

<sup>26</sup> MPEDUCAT had the lowest mean, thus the greatest relative importance, among all 14 MP items (#'s 75-88) in the MSI.

skewed include MPCHILD, POPUCRIS, DSRASKID, and DSWHNKID.<sup>27</sup> The mode for each of these variables was the extreme positive response ("1"), and the combined three most negative responses ("4" + "5" + "6") comprised only 10-25% of any of their distributions. The frequency distributions below<sup>28</sup> indicate spread in four variables, three of which (ADOPTKID, DSWHNKID, and NATUBRTH) had variance scores clearly higher than any other parental role variables.

In summary, though the husband-wife relationship was very strongly affirmed, there was ambiguity over whether the husband-wife role was something in opposition to and more to be valued than the parental role. The chance to have children was highly valued, despite a more liberal attitude toward abortion. There was considerable discussion about when to have children and some advocacy of natural childbirth, but NATUBRTH and DSWHNKID exhibited considerable variation of opinion on these matters. There was also a considerable range of opinion on whether a couple should adopt children after they have given birth to two, but generally the range was within degrees of agreement. There was a strong tendency to consider two children as normative for a family in light of the population crisis. Considering that couples in the sample were mostly childless, it was significant that there was a great extent of discussion of how to raise the children, more agreement than

<sup>27</sup> The considerable amount of discussion indicated by DSRASKID and DSWHNKID was further supported by their ranking as two of the four lowest means for the 15 DS items in the Marital Style Inventory (#'s 100-114).

|                                   |  | Agree   |               |          |           | Disagree |          |               |     |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------|---------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|---------------|-----|
|                                   |  | Missing | very strongly | strongly | mildly    | mildly   | strongly | very strongly |     |
| ADOPTKID %'s                      |  | 1.6     | 25.3          | 17.6     | 24.5      | 13.8     | 8.9      | 8.3           |     |
| NATUBRTH                          |  | 2.2     | 15.8          | 15.0     | 26.5      | 19.2     | 12.3     | 9.1           |     |
| BRESTFED                          |  | 2.2     | 25.1          | 21.3     | 27.7      | 12.8     | 6.1      | 4.7           |     |
| Extent of discussion with spouse: |  |         |               |          | Extensive |          | -        | no            |     |
| DSWHNKID %'s                      |  | missing |               |          | 1         | 2        | 3        | 4             | 5   |
|                                   |  | 0.3     |               |          | 34.4      | 23.7     | 17.6     | 9.5           | 6.3 |
|                                   |  |         |               |          |           |          |          |               | 7.9 |

disagreement that raising the children properly is the biggest task of a marriage, and even some advocacy of certain means of child rearing (e.g., breast feeding) and strong commitment to provide education for the children. Perhaps the best way to characterize the sample on the parent dimension is that there was an underlying expectation of and valuation of parenthood despite its underplayed emphasis relative to companionship. How much of this is related to the decreasing salience of the parental role in general and how much is related to the young adult stage of the life cycle is an interesting matter for speculation.

### Leisure Roles

A social and recreational life was an important dimension for this sample. For example, they mildly agreed that "We go out more often as a couple than my parents did" (GOOUTOFN), and estimated that they had gone out with just their spouse on the average of three times in the past month (TIMESOUT). They also estimated that on the average they as a couple visited another couple socially every other week (SOCVISIT). But not all leisure was necessarily social. They indicated varying degrees of interest in certain self-expressive activity. They were moderately to highly interested in "Do-it-yourself things" (NTDOITUR), moderately interested in "Hobbies" (NTHOBBY), and "Artistic or creative expression" (NTPAINT). They were moderately to highly interested in camping (NTCAMP) and judged as very important traveling and seeing new, interesting places and things (MPTRAVEL). They expressed a preference for self-generated as opposed to commercial entertainment. They mildly disagreed that "We choose commercialized entertainment before self-made recreation" (NTERTAIN), and strongly agreed that "Making your fun is

superior to buying it" (MAKEFUN). They estimated only a moderate extent of discussion of "how money is spent on leisure activities" (DSLEISMN), mildly disagreed that "Social and recreational activities are a big budget item for us" (SOCBUDGT), and over one-half of the sample estimated that they spent less than 5% of their weekly budget on social and recreational activities (PBUDGSOC). Commercial activity which did interest them was "dining out with your spouse" (NTDINOUT) which is highly focused on the companionship aspect in which they were highly interested. They were slightly to very slightly interested, however, in "going to a night club" (NTNITCLB).

Few especially interesting relationships call attention to themselves, nor do the generalizations above seem to require much qualification. The lack of interest in night clubs or in painting is further accentuated by the fact that these were the two of the 18 NT items (#'s 119-136 in the MSI) with the highest means, thus with the least interest. On the other hand, NTDINOUT was one of the three (of the 18) for which there was the most interest.

Among the 16 leisure variables, the three with the least variance were MPTRAVEL (only 11% considered it only slightly or even less important), MAKEFUN (only 5% disagreed), and NTDINOUT (only 3% were only slightly or less interested). The two (of the 16) with the most variance were TIMESOUT and NTARTEXP, with distributions as follows:

|          |   | more than 4-6 3 |                  |              |                 |               |               |                   |
|----------|---|-----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
|          |   | <u>missing</u>  | <u>6 times</u>   | <u>times</u> | <u>times</u>    | <u>twice</u>  | <u>once</u>   | <u>not-at-all</u> |
| TIMESOUT | % | 1.0             | 26.5             | 16.8         | 15.4            | 15.2          | 15.4          | 9.7               |
|          |   | Interested      |                  |              |                 |               |               |                   |
|          |   | very            |                  |              |                 |               |               |                   |
|          |   | <u>missing</u>  | <u>very high</u> | <u>high</u>  | <u>moderate</u> | <u>slight</u> | <u>slight</u> | <u>not</u>        |
| NTARTEXP | % | 0,0             | 20.2             | 20.2         | 23.3            | 12.1          | 11.7          | 12.6              |

To summarize the roles with respect to the sample, they do go out socially with their spouse nearly every week, and visit other couples socially nearly every other week, estimating that they go out a bit more often than their parents did. They were highly interested in dining out, which has a strong focus on companionship. Regarding self-expressive activities, they were moderately interested in hobbies, do-it-yourself things, and artistic and creative expression, but not much interested in painting. They were interested in camping and travel and seeing new places and things. Generally, they did not estimate that they spent much on their social and recreational budget, preferring self-made entertainment to commercial entertainment like night clubs. Other variables which must be considered in light of these leisure variables but which were included in other dimensions are those dealing with companionship, in which there was a great deal of interest in talking with one's spouse about anything and everything, an extended use of leisure time, and the sexual roles, in which the playful aspects of sexual expression were highly affirmed. The section on media will summarize material relevant to the entertainment aspects of media.

### Economic Roles

There was considerable ambiguity in economic roles, especially of husbands and wives. Though the sample mildly agreed that "Both husband and wife should contribute to the family income" (HWFAMINC), "the wife's having a career" (MPWIFCAR) was only slightly important, compared to "the wife's being a good cook and housekeeper" (MPCOOK), which was considered moderately to very important. Although they mildly agreed that "A wife can earn more than her husband and not cause

irreparable damage" (WIFEEARN), they considered very important "the husband's holding a steady, well-paying job" (MPHUSJOB). There was also ambiguity in the degree to which economic values were allowed to dominate career considerations. The sample was divided (50% agree) over whether "Pay and prestige are very important considerations in taking a job" (PRESTIGJ) but mildly agreed that "Advancement opportunities are as important as personal satisfaction in choosing a job or occupation" (ADVANCEJ). There was strong agreement that "In the choice of a job, the emotional consequences to me and my family are more important than the pay" (EMOTIONJ). Despite the report of considerable discussion between spouses regarding "experiences at work" (DSWORKXP),<sup>29</sup> "business or professional meetings" (NTBSNMT) was one of the activities in which the sample had the least interest.<sup>30</sup> The mean response to "How old were you when you decided on your career or occupation?" (CAREERAG) was 19-21. They mildly agreed that "I see several career possibilities in my future" (MANYCAR) and mildly to strongly agreed that "Changing ones (sic) career or occupation is to be expected in our rapidly changing society" (CHANGCAR). Expected career mobility was held in tension with expected residential stability, evidenced by mild disagreement that "Settling down in one place is not very important" (NOSETTLE). Further, they mildly disagreed that "Apartment living has distinct advantages over living in a house" (APARTMNT), strongly agreed that "Owning your home is to be preferred to renting" (OWNHOME), and considered moderately

---

<sup>29</sup> DSWORKXP had the lowest mean (1.98) of the 15 DS items, indicating the most discussion of experiences at work.

<sup>30</sup> The mean for NTBSNMT (4.26) was one of the three highest means of the 18 NT items.



to very important "having a comfortable house" (MPHOUSE). They were highly interested in "working on the house, car or other property" (NTPROPRT). They valued economic stability, seeing "adequate savings and investment" (MPSAVING) as moderately to very important. Consumer items were not considered so important. For instance, "having labor saving appliances" (MPLABSAV) and "the kind of house, car, and clothes" (MPCARCLO) were judged of only slight to moderate importance,<sup>31</sup> and there was only moderate discussion of "the kind of furniture to get" (DSFURNIT).

When variance scores for all the economic role variables were ordered from lowest to highest, variances for the following variables clustered at the low end of the scale: MPSAVING, 1.01; EMOTIONJ, .98; MPHUSJOB, .93; MPMOUSE, .92; DSWORKXP, 1.09; MPCOOK, 1.12; MPCARCLO, 1.24; NTPROPRT, 1.33; OWNHOME, 1.34; CHANGCAR, 1.36; HWFAMINC, 1.37; MPLABSAV, 1.38. At the other extreme, unusually high variance was exhibited by DSFURNIT, 2.99; CAREERAG, 2.62; ADVANCEJ, 2.23; and MPWIFCAR, 2.21. For DSFURNIT the frequency distribution reflected considerable spread, with each possible score on the distribution selected by not less than 15.4% nor more than 18.2% of the sample. The contrast of certain high- and low-variance variables highlights certain ambiguities within the economic role dimension. Regarding career expectations for man and wife, there was unusually low variance on MPHUSJOB and MPCOOK, but unusually high variance on MPWIFCAR. Their

---

<sup>31</sup> When means for all 14 MP items were ordered for comparison, two of the three highest means were MPLABSAV and MPCARCLO. Thus, these items were judged least important of the presented options.

distributions are compared and contrasted below:

|          |    | How Important? |                  |             |                 |               |                    |                   |
|----------|----|----------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|          |    | <u>missing</u> | <u>extremely</u> | <u>very</u> | <u>moderate</u> | <u>slight</u> | <u>very slight</u> | <u>not at all</u> |
| MPHUSJOB | %s | .8             | 36.2             | 37.0        | 20.4            | 4.5           | .6                 | .6                |
| MPCOOK   |    | .8             | 14.4             | 33.0        | 38.7            | 8.9           | 2.4                | 1.8               |
| MPWIFCAR |    | 1.2            | 4.5              | 12.3        | 28.3            | 20.8          | 15.0               | 18.0              |

Regarding values which determine job choice, there was unusually low variance on EMOTIONJ, but unusually high variance on ADVANCEJ. These two are contrasted below, along with the spread exhibited by PRESTIGJ.

|          |    | Agree          |                    |               |               | Disagree      |               |                    |
|----------|----|----------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|
|          |    | <u>missing</u> | <u>very strong</u> | <u>strong</u> | <u>mildly</u> | <u>mildly</u> | <u>strong</u> | <u>very strong</u> |
| EMOTIONJ | %s | .6             | 33.0               | 38.5          | 21.9          | 4.0           | 1.0           | 1.0                |
| ADVANCEJ |    | 0              | 11.9               | 22.9          | 23.5          | 16.4          | 16.8          | 8.5                |
| PRESTIGJ |    | .2             | 4.5                | 13.0          | 32.4          | 22.3          | 19.2          | 8.3                |

Further, there was low variance on MPHOUSE, but high variance on APARTMNT, a contrast which is illustrated by the following distributions:

|         |  | How Important? |                  |             |                 |               |                    |            |
|---------|--|----------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------|
|         |  | <u>missing</u> | <u>extremely</u> | <u>very</u> | <u>moderate</u> | <u>slight</u> | <u>very slight</u> | <u>not</u> |
| MPHOUSE |  | .2             | 16.4             | 37.2        | 35.0            | 8.5           | 2.8                | 0          |

  

|          |  | Agree          |                    |               |             | Disagree    |               |                    |
|----------|--|----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|
|          |  | <u>missing</u> | <u>very strong</u> | <u>strong</u> | <u>mild</u> | <u>mild</u> | <u>strong</u> | <u>very strong</u> |
| APARTMNT |  | .2             | 3.2                | 8.1           | 19.2        | 19.6        | 21.7          | 28.1               |

To summarize economic role prescriptions, this largely middle-class sample, many of whom are students, saw the husband as the primary breadwinner and the wife as primarily responsible for home maintenance. Though there was some openness to a wife's contributing to the family income, there was great divergence of opinion as to whether it was important for the wife to have a career. There was considerable consensus, however, that it was important for the husband to have a steady, well-paying job and for the wife to be a good cook and housekeeper. But career expectations are not merely economic. There was considerable consensus that emotional considerations of a job are more

important than the pay, and there was considerable ambivalence about whether advancement opportunities are as important as personal satisfaction and about whether pay and prestige are important considerations in job choice. Despite the downplay of economic in favor of emotional considerations in career development, there was considerable expectation of a basically comfortable economic status and that one's economic goods would increase. For instance, owning a home was preferable to renting, and having a comfortable house and adequate savings and investments were deemed important. There was a great deal of interest in working on one's house, car, and other property, although labor saving appliances and the kind of house, car and clothes were considered only moderately important. This relative economic comfort was associated with the expectation of stability. A majority felt that settling down in one place is important, which is an interesting contrast to their fairly strong feeling that career changes are to be expected and their moderate expectation that there may be many career possibilities for their own futures.

#### DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON AGENTS

##### Media

Data most closely related to the question of media influence in learning for marriage are the responses to question #163, regarding agencies "that definitely influenced you in your learning about and preparation for marriage." The percentages of persons responding to

each item are presented in Table 3.2:

Table 3.2

| Frequency of Response to #163,<br>Influences in Learning about and Preparation for Marriage, N = 506 |                               |                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <u>Item</u>                                                                                          | <u>Absolute<br/>Frequency</u> | <u>Relative<br/>Frequency (%)</u> |
| Books                                                                                                | 233                           | 46                                |
| Magazines                                                                                            | 124                           | 25                                |
| Television                                                                                           | 57                            | 11                                |
| Relatives                                                                                            | 115                           | 23                                |
| Parents                                                                                              | 332                           | 66                                |
| Dating Experience                                                                                    | 354                           | 70                                |
| Friendships                                                                                          | 305                           | 60                                |
| Premarital counseling by a minister                                                                  | 126                           | 25                                |
| Marriage and Family course                                                                           | 85                            | 17                                |
| Living on one's own                                                                                  | 249                           | 49                                |
| Others:                                                                                              |                               |                                   |
| Living together before marriage                                                                      | 17                            | 3                                 |

Media items (PRBOOKS, PRMAG, PRTV) ranked low by comparison to Parents (PRPARENT), Dating (PRDATING), and Friendships (PRFRIEND). However, nearly half acknowledged influence by books (PRBOOKS), about as many as acknowledged "living on one's own" (PRLIVING). Magazines (PRMAG) were checked by about one fourth, about the same number who checked a marriage and family course (PRCOURSE). In the category "other" 17 respondents specified "living together before marriage" (PRLIVTOG) as an influence. There can be no accurate reading of the actual percentage who might have checked this item had it been listed. The number of persons who volunteered this information for a questionnaire sponsored by a church agency when the church is generally considered not to sanction such behavior may indicate a higher percentage of such behavior than 3%. Comparison of this data to Komarovsky's (1964)<sup>32</sup> is broadly

---

<sup>32</sup> See above, p. 22ff.

instructive, since in both, reported use of media as marital learning source is relatively much lower than parents and peers, though books had more influence, both by frequency of use, and by relative comparison to magazines, for the present, highly educated sample. Also, whereas only 9% of Komarovsky's blue collar sample were influenced by "experts", 25% of this middle class sample cited the minister and 17% a marriage and family course as influential.

Further data on attitudes and behaviors indicates degrees of media involvement. In response to the question, "How many times have you and your spouse attended a movie theater in the last three months?" (MOVIATND) 12% reported 6-8 times or more; 25%, 3-5 times; 39%, once or twice; and 22%, "none." They mildly agreed that "We usually discuss the movies we see in relationship to our own life and experience" (DISCMOVI) (33% strongly or very strongly agree, 36% mildly agree, only 31% disagree in any way). They mildly disagreed, however, that "Contemporary movies have been an education for our own marriage" (MOVIESED). There was considerable spread over the four response options from "mildly agree" to "very strongly disagree," so that persons who agreed only mildly agreed, and many who disagreed, strongly or very strongly disagreed (very strongly agree, 1.4%; strongly agree, 5.9%; mildly agree, 28.9%; mildly disagree, 26.3%; strongly disagree, 19.0%; very strongly disagree, 18%). The sample was only slightly to moderately interested in "watching television" (NTTV) (19% highly or very highly interested; 34% moderately interested; 46% slightly, very slightly or not at all interested), but they were moderately to highly interested in "reading" (NTREAD) (56% highly or very highly interested; 29% moderately; and 15% slightly, very slightly or not at all interested).

To the question, "How many magazine articles on sex and marriage have you read in the last six months?" (MAGAZINE) 18% indicated 6 or more; 28%, 3-5; 22%, one or two; and 21% none. To the question, "How many books on sex and marriage have you read in the last six months?" (BOOKS) 25% indicated two or more; 27%, one; and 46%, none.

In summary, for the movies actual media involvement seemed to outstrip acknowledged media influence. Most of the sample had attended at least one or two movies in three months (Two-fifths attended at least a movie a month and only one-fifth attended none), and most discussed the movies in relation to their lives. But less than two-fifths felt that movies had been an education for their marriage. The preference for reading over watching television was evidenced by more acknowledged influence in marriage preparation from books (46%) and magazines (25%) than from television (11%). Continued reference to these sources was indicated by reported reading (over the previous six month period) of material specifically on sex and marriage. Just over half had read at least one book (just under half had read none), and nearly half had read at least three magazine articles (only about a fifth had read none).

### Parents

Attitudes and behaviors indicating degrees of involvement with parents are summarized here to further clarify the degree of parental influence (66%) indicated by response to question #163. Most described their relationship with their parents (PRNTREL) as "close" (45%), with 11% "unusually close," 35% "fair" or "separated but not negative," and only 7% as "cool," "strained," or "estranged." Their relationship with spouse's parents was similar (SPRNTREL), with 37% "close," (7% unusually close), 35% "fair," 10% "separated but not negative," and only 9%

"cool," "strained," or "entranged." This closeness is borne out by reported behavior, since 35% report "face to face contacts" (PRNTFACE) with their parents once a week or more, 33% once or twice a month. The 30% reporting such contact only four times a year was clearly deviant from a normal curve and this deviance disappears on the reported frequency of "contacts by letter or phone" (PRNTPHON) indicating PRNTFACE may confound psychic with geographic distance. Letter or phone contacts average between once a week and twice a month, with 25% at three per week or more; 33% once per week; 33% once or twice per month; and only 7% four times per year or less. Though close to parents, they considered very important "being free and independent from your parents" (MPINDEPN) (33% extremely important, 35% very important, 19% moderately important, and only 12% slightly, very slightly, or not at all important). Only 37% reported receiving financial support from one or both parents after marriage (PRNTSUPP).

They mildly disagreed (44% agreed, 54% disagreed) that "My parents occupy a very significant place in my way of life now" (PARNTSIG) and mildly disagreed (38% agreed, 61% disagreed) that "My parents are closer to me than friends my own age" (PRNTCLOS).

To summarize the indicators of parental influence, the sample was generally close to their parents. Less than 10% characterized their relations to parents in extreme negative terms; less than 10% reported extremely few phone or letter contacts with parents. Another 10% were unusually close to their parents; 10% reported three or more face to face contacts per week; about 10% indicated more than three phone or letter contacts per week. Despite generally strong expectations that one should be free and independent from parents, about two-fifths of

the sample agreed that their parents occupied a very significant place in their way of life, and two-fifths felt that their parents were closer than their peers.

### Peers

In addition to parents, dating experiences (70%) and friendships (60%) were strongly indicated as influences in preparation for marriage. The sample mildly agreed (70% agreed, 29% disagreed) that "Most of my friends have the same life style (way of life) I do" (LIFESTYL).<sup>33</sup> They were highly interested in "being with a few friends" (NTFREND), (66% highly or very highly interested, 26% moderately, and 8% slightly, very slightly or not at all interested), but only slightly interested in "personal growth groups" (NTGROGRP), (7.1% very highly interested, 11.9% highly, 16.2% moderately, 18.8% slightly, 25.9% very slightly, and 20.2% not at all interested). The variance on NTGROGRP was nearly the highest among the variables representing peer agency, and the variance on NTFREND was the lowest. Despite lack of interest in growth groups, in response to "If you had the opportunity to be involved in some discussion on the first years of marriage with other couples your age, would you be interested?" (DISCUSS), 59% said "yes"; 23%, undecided; and only 16%, "no." The frequency with which the couples "visit another couple socially" (SOCVISIT) was on the average every other week (28%), with 37% weekly or twice a week or more, 22% once a month, and 13% several

---

<sup>33</sup> This feeling of common lifestyle with peers may be contrasted with questions indicating certain felt differences from parents' lifestyles. For instance, 89% agreed that "Communication is more open in our marriage than it was in my parent's (sic)" (OPENCOMM), 70% agreed that "We go out more often as a couple than my parents did" (GOOUTOFN), and only 25% agreed that "The standard of living we have is virtually the same as my parents had" (LIVSTAND).



times a year or once a year. The mean response to "How frequently do you alone spend some time with a friend?" (FRENDTIM) was also every other week, but this item reflected the greatest variance of any of the peer agent variables (18% twice a week or more, 26.1% weekly, 15.8% every other week, 19.0% once a month, 14.2% several times a year, 5.9% once a year).

There was not much data on peer relationships. What there was indicated that most had considerable contact with friends, both in social visits as a couple, and in time spent alone with a friend. They were highly interested in spending time with friends and they generally considered their lifestyle similar to that of most of their friends. Though there was considerable interest in group discussion of early years of marriage, there was much less interest in personal growth groups.

A rough comparison<sup>34</sup> of the relative frequency of contact with parent, peer and media agents is indicated by reorganizing frequency distributions for selected variables along a common time scale below:

Table 3.3

| Frequency of Contact with Parents, Peers, and Media |                                 |                    |                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
|                                                     | Percentage Indicating Frequency |                    |                              |
|                                                     | 1/week<br>or more               | 1/month<br>or more | several<br>times/yr. or less |
| PRNTPHON                                            | 58                              | 33                 | 7                            |
| letter or phone contact with parents                |                                 |                    |                              |
| SOCVISIT                                            | 37                              | 50                 | 13                           |
| frequency of couple visits socially                 |                                 |                    |                              |
| FRENDTIM                                            | 44                              | 35                 | 20                           |
| frequency of time alone with friend                 |                                 |                    |                              |
| MOVIATND                                            | --                              | 39                 | 60                           |
| frequency of movie attendance                       |                                 |                    |                              |

<sup>34</sup> The comparison must be considered merely a rough estimate, since neither the dimensions tested nor the measurement scales were exactly equivalent.

If influence were indicated on the basis of contact alone. then parental influence would be greatest for the sample, peers would be somewhat less and movies would have little influence. Ubiquitousness is only one indicator, however. We do not have comparable data on frequency of discussions of sex and marriage with parents and peers to indicate the relative importance of the 18% who read a magazine article on the subject at least once a month. To further clarify the inter-relations of these variables representing the socialization agents--media, parents and peers--is the task of Chapter 4. Out of that chapter will come a rationale for a way of classifying the sample along these three dimensions in order to examine their effects on the previously described role dimensions.

## Chapter 4

## EXPLORATORY FINDINGS: CLUES TO CLASSIFICATION

The previous chapter described the data as a single sample exhibiting central tendencies and variability on marital role and socialization agent variables. The findings reported in this chapter resulted from exploring beyond that simplification in order to isolate sub-samples which would allow comparison of high and low media, parent and peer influences.

Chiefly, the results were obtained from chi-square analysis of the "PR-" variables (MSI item #163) in order to compare those who checked a particular agent as influential in learning and preparation for marriage with those who did not. For media this involved three possible sources of influence--books (PRBOOKS), magazines (PRMAG), and television (PRTV); for peers, two--dating (PRDATING) and friendships (PRFREND); and for parents, only one (PRPARENT). To counteract the results of response set and to further isolate a "pure" media, parent, or peer sample, the RSET analyses<sup>1</sup> were used to isolate those persons who included one of the non-typical *media* influences even if they did not indicate many other influences, or those who failed to include the typical *parent* or *peer* responses, even though they had included many other influences. The attempt was to isolate "deviant" populations, either highly impacted by media influences, or unusually distanced from the normal parent and peer influences. Descriptive data for the RSET analyses may be found in Appendix E-2. Means for the agent variables

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter 3, p. 162f, for a description of the procedures used.

were compared by eyeball estimate as well as interval estimation of mean differences, comparing the mean for the deviant sub-sample with the mean for the sample taken as a whole. Further evidence reported in this chapter includes significant results from systematic pair-wise correlations of all the agent variables.

Such data-dredging for interesting relationships no doubt uncovered some erroneous relations significant merely by chance. Also, since the exploration for possible sub-samples was the intent, tests of significance were used as indicators of interest and not as tests of relationship. Reporting such results would be extremely complex if every relationship which was examined were to be reported. A very liberal interpretation of "significance" was used in order to discover serendipitous relations. However, in the findings reported here, the firmest relationships shall be distinguished from eyeball estimates and relations of lesser significance. The criterion for reporting of "firm" results shall be  $p < .05$  for chi-square statistics. For Pearson product-moment correlations, in addition to the criterion of  $p < .001$ , only variables in a given set<sup>2</sup> which have a high amount of shared variance in comparison to the set will be reported as "firm." For the RSET comparisons results will be considered "firm" if interval estimation of mean differences achieved a confidence level of  $P \geq .90$ .

Once the skeleton of firm results has been reported, then free use will be made of statistics with lesser degrees of significance and of eyeball estimates based on graphic indication if such findings add to the substantive description of the comparative samples. The purpose

---

<sup>2</sup>E.g., inter-correlations among all "media variables" is a set; "media with parent" inter-correlations would be another set, etc.

of the chapter is not to "prove" relationship, but to achieve a "best guess" of the comparative groups which may be used to classify the sample with respect to socialization agents. For example, based on the present data, if one were to force a description of the "high media influence" population, how would one describe it with respect to degrees of parent and peer influences? Such a description will provide a useful context for later interpretation of findings of any interactions of media influence with that of parents and peers. It will also indicate something of the complexity which will be sacrificed in the search for a parsimonious model in chapter 5. The last section of this chapter provides a rationale for the choice of classifiers which will most judiciously summarize the relations obtained in Chapter 4 and serve as the basis of the confirmatory analysis reported in Chapter 5.

#### COMPARATIVE MEDIA SAMPLES

Examination of the inter-correlations among the media variables provides a basis for describing comparative samples with respect to media influence. The "firm" findings allow the following relationships to be described. Chi-square analyses indicated that, compared to those who did not, those who did check "books" as influential in their learning and preparation for marriage did in fact read more books<sup>3</sup> and magazines<sup>4</sup> on sex and marriage and had a greater interest in reading.<sup>5</sup> Those who checked "magazines" as influential also read more magazines<sup>6</sup> and

---

<sup>3</sup> PRBOOKS by BOOKS,  $\chi^2 = 39.08$ , 5 df,  $p < .001$

<sup>4</sup> PRBOOKS by MAGAZINE,  $\chi^2 = 32.32$ , 5df,  $p < .001$

<sup>5</sup> PRBOOKS by NTREAD,  $\chi^2 = 18.75$ , 5 df,  $p < .005$

<sup>6</sup> PRMAG by MAGAZINE,  $\chi^2 = 63.37$ , 5df,  $p < .001$

books<sup>7</sup> on sex and marriage, agreed more that the movies<sup>8</sup> were an education for their marriage, and discussed more the movies' relation to their lives.<sup>9</sup> Those who checked "television" as influential also agreed more that movies<sup>10</sup> were an education for their marriage and attended more movies;<sup>11</sup> they had more interest in watching television,<sup>12</sup> and read more magazines<sup>13</sup> on sex and marriage. In the RSET analysis, the "pure" TV-influenced sample, despite a very small  $n$  ( $= 10$ ), illustrated confident differences from the grand mean on means for MOVIESED<sup>14</sup> and NTTV.<sup>15</sup> Among the media variable correlations reported at Appendix E-1.1, two pairs of correlations were outstanding in the amount of variance shared (about 16%). The number of books read on sex and marriage was positively correlated with the number of magazines read.<sup>16</sup> And there was a tendency for those for whom movies had been an education also to be those who discussed the movies in relation to their own lives.<sup>17</sup> An additional eight pairs of significant correlations among the media variables ranged from .120 to .230.

What can be said about media comparative groups on the basis of the firm findings just reported? First, indication that a source was an

---

<sup>7</sup> PRMAG by BOOKS,  $\chi^2 = 17.10$ , 5df,  $p < .005$

<sup>8</sup> PRMAG by MOVIESED,  $\chi^2 = 33.65$ , 5df,  $p < .001$

<sup>9</sup> PRMAG by DISCMOVI,  $\chi^2 = 12.36$ , 5df,  $p < .05$

<sup>10</sup> PRTV by MOVIESED,  $\chi^2 = 28.59$ , 5df,  $p < .001$

<sup>11</sup> PRTV by MOVIATND,  $\chi^2 = 12.80$ , 5df,  $p < .05$

<sup>12</sup> PRTV by NTTV,  $\chi^2 = 17.68$ , 5df,  $p < .005$

<sup>13</sup> PRTV by MAGAZINE,  $\chi^2 = 13.07$ , 5df,  $p < .025$

<sup>14</sup> Estimation of MOVIESED mean differences, "pure" TV ( $n = 10$ ) vs.  $\bar{X}$  ( $n = 506$ ):  $P(.02 < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < .94) = .90$ .

<sup>15</sup> Estimation of NTTV mean differences, "pure" TV vs.  $\bar{X}$ :  $P(.65 < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < 1.81) = .95$

<sup>16</sup> BOOKS with MAGAZINE,  $r = -.441$ ,  $n = 502$ ,  $p < .000$

<sup>17</sup> MOVIESED with DISCMOVI,  $r = .355$ ,  $n = 502$ ,  $p < .000$

influence was related to behavioral indicators of the same--books with more book reading, magazines with more magazine reading, and television with more reported interest in television viewing. Further, book and magazine reading was related to all of the media sources and not just its particular source. (This latter statement is true if one includes a weak chi-square relation,  $p < .250$ , of PRTV by BOOKS). This is not surprising given the high degree of correlation between number of books and number of magazines read. Further, if one includes a weak PRBOOKS by MOVIESED relation,<sup>18</sup> then MOVIESED relates positively to all of the media sources. In short, the findings thus far reported lead to the conclusion that there is a great deal of inter-relation among the media sources--books, magazines, television, and movies. But MOVIESED was not as strongly related to PRBOOKS and the number of books read was not as strongly related to PRTV.

The negative correlation of interest in watching television and interest in reading<sup>19</sup> provides a clue that there are at least two different media populations, a fact that has already been hinted at by the firm relations reported above. Is there further evidence that would corroborate this assumption that there is a "reading" population and a "television viewing" one? What evidence there is will be reported by the categories books, magazines, television and movies.

The weak indication that those who checked PRBOOKS as an influence in their marriage preparation also agreed more on MOVIESED was corroborated by the correlation (about 2% shared variance) of MOVIESED

---

<sup>18</sup> PRBOOKS by MOVIESED,  $\chi^2 = 8.10$ , 5 df,  $p < .10$

<sup>19</sup> NTTV with NTREAD,  $r = -.209$ ,  $n = 506$ ,  $p < .001$

and BOOKS,<sup>20</sup> indicating more books read on sex and marriage if more agreement on MOVIESED. It was contradicted, however, by the "pure" book group (see Appendix E-2.1). Eyeball comparison of means for this group against the grand mean and especially against the "pure" magazine and television samples indicated that the "book" sample actually disagreed more on MOVIESED, had indeed read more books, and had lower interest in watching television.

Although interest in reading had been very strongly related to PRBOOKS, it was only very weakly related to PRMAG.<sup>21</sup> In fact, when the "pure" magazine group mean for NTREAD was compared to the grand mean and to means for the "pure" book and TV groups, there was least interest in reading among the magazine group. Of all the samples compared in Appendix E-2.1, the "pure" magazine group had read the least books. When the "pure" magazine group rankings of the PR- items was compared with the same rankings for the RSET 3 group (at Table 4.1), PRBOOKS had

Table 4.1

RANKED PERCENTAGES OF PERSONS CHECKING "PR-" ITEMS  
FOR RSET 3 and "PURE" MAGAZINE SAMPLES

| "Pure" Magazine Group<br>n = 15 |     | RSET 3 Group<br>n = 108 |    |
|---------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|----|
|                                 | %   |                         | %  |
| PRMAG                           | 100 | PRDATING                | 70 |
| PRDATING                        | 53  | PRFREND                 | 54 |
| PRBOOKS                         | 40  | PRPARENT                | 52 |
| PRPARENT                        | 33  | PRLIVING                | 42 |
| PRLIVING                        | 13  | PRBOOKS                 | 32 |
| PRPASTOR                        | 13  | PRPASTOR                | 19 |
| PRFREND                         | 13  | PRCOURSE                | 12 |
| PRTV                            | 7   | PRMAG                   | 11 |
| PRRELATI                        | 7   | PRRELATI                | 6  |
| PRCOURSE                        | 0   | PRTV                    | 3  |

<sup>20</sup> MOVIESED with BOOKS,  $r = -.156$ ,  $n = 499$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>21</sup> PRMAG by NTREAD,  $\chi^2 = 6.70$ , 5df,  $p < .250$



more influence (especially relative to PRFRIENDS) and PRTV was more influential (at the expense of PRCOURSE) for those most influenced by magazines. The "magazine" sample's greater agreement on MOVIESED is corroborated by comparing the "pure" magazine group against the grand mean or the "pure" book group. MOVIESED and MAGAZINE shared about 4% variance.<sup>22</sup>

The "television" sample, like the "magazine" sample, agreed that movies had been an education for their marriage<sup>23</sup> much more than the "book" sample had agreed. Comparison of the "pure" TV group's ranking of the PR items with those of RSET 4 (see Table 4.2) indicated that magazines (PRMAG) were more influential than might be expected in the "pure" TV group, with the increase in television and magazine influence cutting most into the influence of PRDATING. The "pure" TV sample, if eyeball comparison of means can be trusted, attended the most movies of any of the media samples.

Table 4.2

RANKED PERCENTAGES OF PERSONS CHECKING "PR-" ITEMS  
FOR RSET 4 AND "PURE" TELEVISION SAMPLES

| "Pure" TV Group<br>n = 10 |     | RSET 4 GROUP<br>n = 99 |    |
|---------------------------|-----|------------------------|----|
|                           | %   |                        | %  |
| PRTV                      | 100 | PRDATING               | 76 |
| PRFRIENDS                 | 60  | PRPARENT               | 75 |
| PRLIVING                  | 60  | PRFRIENDS              | 72 |
| PRPARENT                  | 50  | PRLIVING               | 54 |
| PRBOOKS                   | 50  | PRBOOKS                | 43 |
| PRMAG                     | 30  | PRPASTOR               | 21 |
| PRPASTOR                  | 10  | PRRELATI               | 20 |
| PRDATING                  | 10  | PRMAG                  | 19 |
| PRRELATI                  | 0   | PRCOURSE               | 13 |
| PRCOURSE                  | 0   | PRTV                   | 7  |

<sup>22</sup> MOVIESED with MAGAZINE,  $r = .210$ ,  $n = 500$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>23</sup> Compare notes 8 and 10.

Thus far, the socialization agent "media" may be broadly characterized into at least two sub-samples--those more interested in television and those more interested in reading. The one sample seemed more oriented to reading books and less oriented to movies. The other sample was less oriented to reading (except magazines) and more toward television and movies.

Further corroboration of the two sub-samples is found by eyeball comparison of the demographic data in Appendix E-24 which shows that the "pure" PRMAG and PRTV groups were more like one another than they were like the "pure" PRBOOK group. Briefly, the book group was probably more educated, less metropolitan, more non-Southern California in origin, older and more male. The magazine and TV groups had less education, were less likely to be students, had lower income but expected the highest income in another ten years, were younger and more metropolitan. In addition the "pure" magazine group was more female, and the "pure" TV group had been married less time, had fewer children, were more Southern Californian in origin, and had less income from the wife. Of course, these demographics are merely suggestive; careful description of the sub-samples remains a task for future investigation. But the possibility of even such tentative description lends weight to the argument that there are two sub-samples.

The movie dimension related to both the book and the television sub-samples. Variables measuring the relative influence of the movies all were highly correlated, indicating some degree of relation of behavior and reported influence. MOVIESED and DISCMOVI shared about 12% variance ( $r = .355$ ,  $n = 502$ ,  $p < .000$ ). MOVIESED and MOVIATND shared only about 3% ( $r = .179$ ,  $n = 498$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Analysis of variance, using

MOVIESED as classifier, provided cell means for MOVIEATND whose graphic presentation indicated that the variance was chiefly accounted for by cells  $M_5$  and  $M_6$  (strongly and very strongly disagree), which averaged fewer movies attended than cells  $M_1$  to  $M_4$ .

The above-reported relation of MOVIESED to PRTV and PRMAG, and to a lesser extent to PRBOOKS, was further clarified by the cross tabulation of PRMEDIA<sup>24</sup> with MOVIESED ( $\chi^2 = 71.45$ , 35df,  $p < .001$ ). There were more observations than expected who agreed on MOVIESED at the "magazine only" and the "all three media" categories. At the "mildly" and "strongly disagree" (on MOVIESED) categories, there were more observations than expected in the "books only" category. And at the "strongly" or "very strongly disagree" categories there were more in the "no media" category. To summarize the relation of movie influence to other media influences, the evidence relating MOVIESED and books was ambiguous, with both stronger agreement and disagreement related to book influence. There seemed to be a clearer relation of MOVIESED to magazine reading and to television viewing, both of which also were related to more discussion of movies (taking into account a weak chi-square relation of PRTV by DISCMOVI at  $p < .250$ ).

Thus far it has been shown that the media variables are highly interrelated so that influence from one medium is likely to correspond to more media influence in general. However, the media as socialization agent has been complicated by the discovery of a book reading group and another television viewing, magazine reading group. The movies are related to both of these sub-samples.

---

<sup>24</sup> See p. 163 in Chapter 3 for a description of this variable.

The next section describes the high and low media groups with respect to their relations to parents.

#### MEDIA SAMPLES DESCRIBED WITH RESPECT TO PARENT SAMPLES

Can the description of high and low media influence be enhanced by the addition of information about parental closeness? First, the firm interrelations of the parent variables themselves are reported.

Far more inter-relation of the parent variables to one another existed than for the media dimension, for which it was considerable. Cross-tabulation of PRPARENT by PRNTREL,<sup>25</sup> by PARNTSIG,<sup>26</sup> and by PRNTCLOS<sup>27</sup> indicated that compared to those who did not, those who did check "parents" as an influence in preparing for marriage had a closer relation to their parents, agreed more that their parents continued to play a significant role in their current way of life, and agreed more that their parents were closer than friends their own age. Further, reported frequency of parental contact, both face to face<sup>28</sup> and by letter or phone<sup>29</sup> was greater for the PRPARENT group. In addition to eleven significant correlation pairs, ranging from  $r = .150$  to  $r = .290$ , the following six pairs, ranging from 16% to 42% shared variance, were all significant at  $p < .000$ . Reported face to face contacts with parents were highly correlated with reported phone or letter contacts.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> PRPARENT by PRNTREL,  $\chi^2 = 44.57$ , 6df,  $p < .001$

<sup>26</sup> PRPARENT by PARNTSIG,  $\chi^2 = 25.26$ , 5df,  $p < .001$

<sup>27</sup> PRPARENT by PRNTCLOS,  $\chi^2 = 21.89$ , 5df,  $p < .001$

<sup>28</sup> PRPARENT by PRNTFACE,  $\chi^2 = 13.87$ , 5df,  $p < .025$

<sup>29</sup> PRPARENT by PRNTPHON,  $\chi^2 = 15.01$ , 5df,  $p < .025$

<sup>30</sup> PRNTFACE with PRNTPHON,  $r = .653$ ,  $n = 490$ ,  $p < .000$

PRNTREL, description of one's relationship to one's parents on a scale from "estranged" to "unusually close", was highly correlated with PARNSIG,<sup>31</sup> PRNTCLOS,<sup>32</sup> as well as to the reported phone or letter contacts.<sup>33</sup> Whether one's parents played a significant role in current way of life had great bearing on whether one felt parents as closer than peers<sup>34</sup> and on the reported number of phone or letter contacts with the parents.<sup>35</sup> A summary of the firm relations must indicate that the parent variables, both attitudes and reported behaviors, were highly related. This gives some degree of confidence that the parent variables measure a common continuum from high parental influence to low.

Though not as strong as the correlations among the parent variables themselves, there was a relationship of the parent and the peer dimension. Cross-tabulation of PRPARENT by NTFREND<sup>36</sup> indicated that persons reporting "parents" as influential were more interested in being with friends. Five pairs of variables were correlated at or near the  $p < .001$  level. Interest in being with friends was positively correlated with more phone or letter contacts with parents.<sup>37</sup> Greater

---

<sup>31</sup> PRNTREL with PARNSIG,  $r = -.483$ ,  $n = 486$ ,  $p < .000$

<sup>32</sup> PRNTREL with PRNTCLOS,  $r = -.455$ ,  $n = 491$ ,  $p < .000$

<sup>33</sup> PRNTREL with PRNTPHON,  $r = .386$ ,  $n = 492$ ,  $p < .000$

<sup>34</sup> PARNSIG with PRNTCLOS,  $r = .448$ ,  $n = 488$ ,  $p < .000$

<sup>35</sup> PARNSIG with PRNTPHON,  $r = -.396$ ,  $n = 486$ ,  $p < .000$

<sup>36</sup> PRPARENT by NTFREND,  $\chi^2 = 18.51$ , 5df,  $p < .005$

<sup>37</sup> NTFREND with PRNTPHON,  $r = -.135$ ,  $n = 496$ ,  $p < .002$

stress on being free and independent from parents was associated with more interest in growth groups.<sup>38</sup> The feeling that parents are closer than one's own peers was associated with spending less time with a friend<sup>39</sup> and making fewer social visits on other couples.<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, good relation to one's parents was associated with more frequent visits of another couple socially.<sup>41</sup> What should be clear from this report of parent/peer correlations is that good relations to parents was generally related to good peer relations, although some parental closeness detracted from time spent with peers. Examination of the cross-tabulation cells for PRPARENT by the variables NTCAMP, DSDIFEXP, DSDISSAT, and DSFURNIT, all significant at  $p < .05$ , and by NTPROPRT and DSDREAMS, significant at  $p < .10$ , indicated that those who did not indicate parental influence were clearly two different population extremes. Those distanced from parents were more likely either non-communicative and alienated altogether, or highly communicative and dependent on peer relations.

What kind of parent relations characterized the comparative media samples? For the high "book influence" sample, where there was more interest in reading (NTREAD), then there was more likelihood that parents were indicated as influential.<sup>42</sup> That was the only firm relationship to be reported here. The direction of that relationship--if

---

<sup>38</sup> MPINDEPN with NTGROGRP,  $r = .139$ ,  $n = 501$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>39</sup> PRNTCLOS with FRENDDIM,  $r = -.140$ ,  $n = 493$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>40</sup> PRNTCLOS with SOCVISIT,  $r = -.138$ ,  $n = 495$ ,  $p < .002$

<sup>41</sup> PRNTREL with SOCVISIT,  $r = -.125$ ,  $n = 493$ ,  $p < .003$

<sup>42</sup> PRPARENT by NTREAD,  $\chi^2 = 12.19$ , 5df,  $p < .05$

high media, then high parent--was further supported by weak ( $p < .250$ ) chi-square statistics for PRBOOK by PRNTPHON and by PRNTSUPP. "Books" were more likely indicated as influential if there were extremely frequent phone or letter contacts with parents and when there was financial support from parents.

For those indicating "magazine" influence, there was more frequent phone or letter contact with parents,<sup>43</sup> the only firm finding related to the magazine sample. Weak chi-square relations corroborated this description. If magazines were indicated as influential, then there was more likely financial support from parents ( $p < .10$ ) and slightly more agreement that parents played a significant role in the person's current way of life ( $p < .250$ ). Correlations of interest in television viewing with PRNTCLOS<sup>44</sup> and PARNTSIG<sup>45</sup> further reinforce the argument that high magazine and TV should be associated with high parent relations. Both correlations were significant at  $p < .001$ , but each only accounted for about 2.6% shared variance. The same relation was found for PRMEDIA by PRPARENT.<sup>46</sup> "No parent" influence was found beyond expectation associated with the "no media" category. And "parent" influence was found beyond expectation in all categories involving magazines and television, singly or in combination.

---

<sup>43</sup> PRMAG by PRNTPHON,  $\chi^2 = 11.37$ , 5df,  $p < .05$

<sup>44</sup> NTTV with PRNTCLOS,  $r = .162$ ,  $n = 498$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>45</sup> NTTV with PARNTSIG,  $r = .159$ ,  $n = 493$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>46</sup> PRMEDIA by PRPARENT,  $\chi^2 = 17.82$ , 7df,  $p < .025$

Another correlation, significant at  $p < .001$ , about 2.6% shared variance, contradicted the above findings for the high media sample. The correlation of MOVIESED and PRNTREL<sup>47</sup> indicated that it was the group who were estranged from parents who agreed most that movies had been an education for their marriage. Comparison of DISCMOVI's mean for the deviant "no-parent-influence" group in the RSET analysis to the grand mean<sup>48</sup> supports the above correlation. In that comparison high media influence (more discussion of movies) was associated with low parental influence (estranged relationship). Thus far, the "best guess" describing the high media group for both books and for magazines and television is that it is associated with parental influence. But along the continuum of *movie* influence, it is actually the reverse situation.

Though the dominant relationship associated high media with high parental influence, there were some indicators of a deviant population in which high media influence was actually related to low parental influence. Above, the association of parental distance was associated with two extreme populations according to peer relations, alienated and gregarious. Visual comparison of the frequencies expected and actually obtained in the chi-square analysis PRTV by PARNTSIG ( $p < .250$ ) indicated that television influence was more likely for those who "very strongly agreed" that their parents were significant to their present way of life, *and* for those who disagreed. Taken by itself, this might be considered a fluke, but there were weak ( $p < .250$ ) chi-square relations for the analysis of PRTV by two other major parent variables--PRNTREL and PRNTCLOS. Checking "television" as influential in one's preparation

---

<sup>47</sup> MOVIESED with PRNTREL,  $r = .164$ ,  $n = 493$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>48</sup> Estimation of DISCMOVI mean differences, "no-parent influence" ( $n=24$ ) vs.  $\bar{X}(n=506)$ :  $P(.04 < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < 1.06) = .90$ .



for marriage was associated beyond expectation both with very strong agreement that parents are closer than one's peers, and with those "estranged" from the parents. Examination of the "pure" TV sample in the RSET analysis (Appendix E-2.1) further indicated this deviant sub-sample. Despite the previously reported positive correlation of NTTV with PARNTSIG and PRNTCLOS, comparison of the "pure" TV sample's means for the parent variables with the grand means indicated at least the direction of more disagreement that parents were presently significant (PARNTSIG) and with a more distant relationship to parents (PRNTREL). Thus, despite the dominant association of high media influence with high parental relations, there was a minor sub-sample for whom high television influence was associated with distant parental relations. Further, eyeball comparison with grand means of media means for the "pure" non-parent influence indicated that those who were *least* likely to consider parents as influential in marriage preparation read more magazines and more books, were more likely to have indicated influence from the media variables (PRBOOKS, PRMAG, PRTV), more likely to discuss the movies, even though they were more likely to have attended no movies and they had less interest in watching television.

In summary, firm findings associated both high book and high television groups with high parent communication. However, firm findings for MOVIESED and many weakly significant indicators for both the book and television samples forced the hypothesis that there was a deviant minority for whom these media influences filled a vacuum left by poor parental relations.

#### MEDIA SAMPLES DESCRIBED WITH RESPECT TO PEER SAMPLES

Now the description of high and low media influence may be

enhanced by the addition of information about peer samples. First, the firm interrelations of the peer variables are reported.

The interrelations of the peer variables were not as pronounced as for the parent and media dimensions. Cross-tabulation of PRFREND by FRENDTIM,<sup>49</sup> by LIFESTYL,<sup>50</sup> and by SOCVISIT<sup>51</sup> indicated that those who reported "friendships" as influential in their preparation for marriage did agree more that their friends have the same lifestyle as they do, did spend more time alone with a friend, and did make more frequent social visits as a couple. In the RSET analysis for the "no-friends influence" group, one can say with confidence that, compared to the sample at large, this group made fewer social visits on other couples.<sup>52</sup> This was further corroborated by the correlation of PRFREND and SOCVISIT.<sup>53</sup> SOCVISIT was also correlated with PRDATING<sup>54</sup> but the relationship was much weaker, as indicated by chi-square statistics for PRDATING by SOCVISIT, only significant at  $p < .250$ . LIFESTYL also related weakly to PRDATING (chi-square significance at  $p < .10$ ). PRDATING by FRENDTIM<sup>55</sup> resulted in a firm chi-square statistic. Thus far, indicators point to more social interaction, and that with peers who share

---

<sup>49</sup> PRFREND by FRENDTIM,  $\chi^2 = 27.21$ , 5df,  $p < .001$

<sup>50</sup> PRFREND by LIFESTYL,  $\chi^2 = 17.25$ , 5df,  $p < .005$

<sup>51</sup> PRFREND by SOCVISIT,  $\chi^2 = 15.49$ , 5df,  $p < .01$

<sup>52</sup> Estimation of SOCVISIT mean differences, "no-friendship" influence ( $n=23$ ) vs.  $\bar{X}(n=506)$ :  $P(.43 < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < 1.45) = .95$

<sup>53</sup> PRFREND with SOCVISIT,  $r = -.165$ ,  $n = 503$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>54</sup> SOCVISIT with PRDATING,  $r = -.116$ ,  $n = 503$ ,  $p < .005$

<sup>55</sup> PRDATING by FRENDTIM,  $\chi^2 = 12.59$ , 5df,  $p < .05$

a common lifestyle, on the part of those who checked "friendships" as influential in marriage. The same relationships hold, but less firmly for those who indicated "dating" as an influence. The six most outstanding correlations within the peer variable set did not account for as much variance as the media and parent correlations had; they ranged from about 4% to 9% shared variance. An additional 8 correlation pairs ranged from  $r = .110$  to  $r = .180$ . Interest in being with a few friends was positively correlated with interest in growth groups,<sup>56</sup> with the frequency of social visits on another couple,<sup>57</sup> and with the amount of time spent alone with a friend.<sup>58</sup> FRENDTIM was also positively related to the frequency of social visits with one's spouse,<sup>59</sup> and to the PRFREND variable.<sup>60</sup> Indication that dating was an influence was positively related to indication that friendships were an influence in marriage preparation.<sup>61</sup> It is clear that the various peer variables were related to one another; attitudes and reported peer influence were correlated with reported behaviors. But there was much more unexplained variance than for the media and parent sets.

Part of this variance may be explained by further description of differences between the "dating" and the "friendship" response and between the interest in being with friends and the interest in growth

---

<sup>56</sup> NTFRENDs with NTGROGRP,  $r = .298$ ,  $n = 506$ ,  $p < .000$

<sup>57</sup> NTFRENDs with SOCVISIT,  $r = .264$ ,  $n = 503$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>58</sup> NTFRENDs with FRENDTIM,  $r = .211$ ,  $n = 501$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>59</sup> FRENDTIM with SOCVISIT,  $r = .291$ ,  $n = 498$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>60</sup> FRENDTIM with PRFRENDs,  $r = -.214$ ,  $n = 501$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>61</sup> PRDATING with PRFRENDs,  $r = .253$ ,  $n = 506$ ,  $p < .001$

groups. While the description of these sub-samples remains for further investigation, and the extensive reporting necessary to indicate these complex relations is not possible in this context, generally, PRFREND and NTFREND seemed to be better indicators of intimate sharing with peers. Comparison of all chi-square relations ( $p < .250$ ) of PRDATING and PRFREND by other agent variables, plus correlations ( $p < .01$ ) of NTGROGRP and of NTFREND with all other agent variables, led to the hypothesis that these indeed were related to differing sub-samples. The variable FRENDATE was created to further clarify differences between dating and friendships, in addition to the isolation of the "non-dating influence" and the "non-friendship-influence" groups in the RSET analysis. Only a sampling of these findings is presented as evidence that led the investigator to the hypothesis stated above. FRENDATE by FRENDTIM<sup>62</sup> resulted in a chi-square statistic significant at  $p < .001$ , indicating that those who reported neither "dating" nor "friendship" influence spent less time with a friend; those who checked "dating" only spent a bit more time with a friend; those who checked "friends" only, yet more time; and the most time with a friend was spent by those persons who reported both dating and friendship influence. On many of the variables significantly related to FRENDATE, "dating only" was more related to those who checked neither peer response, and "friendships only" was more related to those who checked both peer responses. The dating response was more often associated with unusually close parent relations and did not necessarily reflect greater peer relations. Similarly, interest in growth groups while relating to many of the same variables as interest in being with a few friends, was related in such a way as to lead to the

---

<sup>62</sup> FRENDATE by FRENDTIM,  $\chi^2 = 41.80$ , 15df,  $p < .001$

hypothesis that interest in growth groups reflected more gregariousness, more formally organized togetherness, a meeting of strangers, while interest in being with a few friends reflected a more intimate, selective sharing relationship with a few friends. It is not intended here to prove the existence of these hypothesized sub-samples, one related to more organized social relationships, the other to sharing of mutual friendships. But the indications which led to the formulation of this hypothesis must be kept in mind as evidence of the complexity which must be sacrificed in the confirmatory model by the simple characterization of high and low peer influence.

No new data on the relation of the parent variables to the peer populations is needed, since it was reported above. In brief review, good parent relations characterized those who had good peer relations. However, there was indication of deviation at both extremes so that both high and low peer relations may be associated with both high and low parent relations. These deviant populations will be further clarified in examination of the relation of the peer variables to the media samples.

How are the high and low media groups to be characterized with respect to peer relations? The firm relations indicate that high media influence was associated with both high and low peer influence. Beginning with the book sample, the most firm indications related high peer influence to this high media group. The variable FRENDATE divided the sample into four categories from neither "dating" nor "friendships" influence, through "dating" only, through "friendships" only, to both "dating" and "friendships." The cross-tabulation FRENDATE by

PRBOOKS<sup>63</sup> indicated that "books" were *more* likely checked as influential where either "friendships only" or both "dating" and "friendships" were influential, and that "books" were *less* likely checked if only "dating" or neither peer response were checked. The correlations of NTREAD with NTGROGRP,<sup>64</sup> NTFRENDS,<sup>65</sup> and FRENDTIM<sup>66</sup> further support the high-media with high-peer relation. Greater interest in reading was associated with greater interest in growth groups and in being with a few friends and with greater time spent with a friend. Further, interest in growth groups was associated with having read a greater number of books on sex and marriage,<sup>67</sup> similar to the cross-tabulation PRBOOKS by NTGROGRP,<sup>68</sup> significant at  $p < .06$ , indicating more interest in growth groups for those who were influenced by books. Contrary to the above findings which indicate an association of high peer influence with high media influence, the cross-tabulation PRBOOKS by LIFESTYL<sup>69</sup> indicated that those influenced by books were less agreeable that most of their friends have the same lifestyle as they do. The "pure" no-friends group in the RSET analysis was more interested in reading.<sup>70</sup> Thus,

---

<sup>63</sup> FRENDATE by PRBOOKS,  $\chi^2 = 37.27$ , 3df,  $p < .001$

<sup>64</sup> NTREAD with NTGROGRP,  $r = .157$ ,  $n = 506$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>65</sup> NTREAD with NTFRENDS,  $r = .173$ ,  $n = 506$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>66</sup> NTREAD with FRENDTIM,  $r = .128$ ,  $n = 501$ ,  $p < .003$

<sup>67</sup> NTGROGRP with BOOKS,  $r = -.168$ ,  $n = 502$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>68</sup> PRBOOKS by NTGROGRP,  $\chi^2 = 11.05$ , 5 df,  $p < .06$

<sup>69</sup> PRBOOKS by LIFESTYL,  $\chi^2 = 14.31$ , 5df,  $p < .025$

<sup>70</sup> Estimation of NTREAD mean differences, "no-friendship" influence ( $n=23$ ) vs.  $\bar{X}(n=506)$ :  $P(.07 < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < .83) = .90$

firm findings for the book-oriented sample, indicated a dominant tendency for persons who read a great deal to be more interested in relating to peers. But there was a small deviant group for which a great deal of reading probably took the place of peer influence.

On the magazine sample, the same type of media/peer relationship held. Cross-tabulation of PRFRENDIS by MAGAZINE<sup>71</sup> indicated that those reporting "friendships" as influential had read more magazine articles on sex and marriage. MAGAZINE was also correlated with NTGROGRP<sup>72</sup> with more magazine reading associated with more interest in growth groups. These associations of high magazine reading with high peer influence were contradicted by the following RSET analyses (see Appendix E-2). The "no-dating"<sup>73</sup> and the "no-friendships"<sup>74</sup> groups actually read more magazines than the sample at large. And the "pure" magazine influence group was less interested in a discussion group on marriage.<sup>75</sup> Eyeball comparison of the "pure" magazine group's peer variable means with the grand means indicated that for SOCVISIT, FRENDTIM, NTGROGRP, and NTFRENDIS the direction of "pure" magazine influence was the same--if high media influence, then more distant peer relations. Thus, *low* peer influence was also associated with high magazine reading. Graphic indication of the weak ( $p < .250$ ) chi-square relation of PRMAG by FRENDTIM

---

<sup>71</sup> PRFRENDIS by MAGAZINE,  $\chi^2 = 23.15$ , 5df,  $p < .001$

<sup>72</sup> MAGAZINE with NTGROGRP,  $r = .114$ ,  $n = 503$ ,  $p < .006$

<sup>73</sup> Estimation of MAGAZINE mean differences, "no-dating influence" ( $n=16$ ) vs.  $\bar{X}(n=506)$ :  $P(.20 < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < 1.88) = .95$ .

<sup>74</sup> Estimation of MAGAZINE mean differences, "no-friendship" ( $n=23$ ) vs.  $\bar{X}(n=506)$ :  $P(.26 < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < 1.76) = .95$ .

<sup>75</sup> Estimation of DISCUSS mean differences, "pure" magazine influence ( $n=15$ ) vs.  $\bar{X}(n=506)$ :  $P(.1 < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < .91) = .90$ .

illustrated the dual population in media/peer relations. Both extremes, high and low time spent with a friend, were associated with greater reporting of "magazines" as influential in marriage preparation.

There were not many firm relations of television viewing and peer variables. Those who reported "dating" as influential were also more interested in watching television than those who did not.<sup>76</sup> The chi-square relation for FRENDATE by NTV, <sup>77</sup> however, indicated the opposite effect, since those who checked "both dating and friendships" or "friendships only" were least interested in watching television, and those who checked neither "peer influence" nor "dating only" were most interested in watching television. The same extremes for FRENDTIM as were reported for the PRMAG variable were found in the weak ( $p < .10$ ) chi-square relation PRTV by FRENDTIM.<sup>78</sup> Television as an influence was associated both with the least and the most frequent FRENDTIM.

The same dual relation of both high and low peer influence with high media influence was observed for the movie variables. Agreement that movies had been an education for marriage was associated with more interest in growth groups<sup>79</sup> and a greater interest in joining a discussion group on marriage.<sup>80</sup> Further, greater discussion of the movies was associated with more interest in growth groups,<sup>81</sup> more interest in

---

<sup>76</sup> PRDATING by NTV,  $\chi^2 = 12.86$ , 5df,  $p < .025$

<sup>77</sup> FRENDATE by NTV,  $\chi^2 = 31.07$ , 15df,  $p < .01$

<sup>78</sup> PRTV by FRENDTIM,  $\chi^2 = 9.45$ , 5df,  $p < .10$

<sup>79</sup> MOVIESED with NTGROGRP,  $r = .133$ ,  $n = 503$ ,  $p < .002$

<sup>80</sup> MOVIESED with DISCUSS,  $r = .140$ ,  $n = 500$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>81</sup> DISCMOVI with NTGROGRP,  $r = .164$ ,  $n = 504$ ,  $p < .001$



joining a discussion group on marriage,<sup>82</sup> and more interest in being with friends.<sup>83</sup> Contrary to this dominant positive relation of movie and peer influence, those who agreed that movies were an education for their marriage were not as likely to agree that most of their friends had the same lifestyle as they did.<sup>84</sup> Comparison of the "non-friends-influence" mean for MOVIESED indicated that this low peer group actually agreed more that the movies had been an education for them.<sup>85</sup>

To summarize the peer and media populations, for every media variable, books, magazines, television, and movies, there was a tendency for both high and low peer influences to be related to high media influence. Correlations were not as pronounced for the peer/media relations, ranging for the 6 pairs significant at  $p < .001$  from only 2.6% to 3.2%. High media influence, whether from books, or magazines and television, or movies, was usually associated with a high degree of influence from parents and from peers, whether from dating and growth groups or from friendships. But for at least some sub-samples high media influence was associated with low parent and/or peer relations. Description of the comparative samples along media, parent, and peer dimensions has indicated something of the complexity of the socialization agent variables, a complexity which will be sacrificed in the confirmatory model. The inter-relations of media, parent, and peer agents also anticipate the interaction effect hypothesis for which

---

<sup>82</sup> DISCMOVI with DISCUSS,  $r = .162$ ,  $n = 500$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>83</sup> DISCMOVI with NTFRENDS,  $r = .178$ ,  $n = 504$ ,  $p < .001$

<sup>84</sup> MOVIESED with LIFESTYL,  $r = -.129$ ,  $n = 501$ ,  $p < .002$

<sup>85</sup> Estimation of MOVIESED mean differences, "no-friendship" ( $n=23$ ) vs.  $\bar{X}$ :  $P(.09 < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < 1.19) = .90$ .

confirmation is sought. The final section of this chapter provides the rationale for the choice of classifiers to represent these agents for the analysis reported in Chapter 5.

#### RATIONALE FOR CHOICE OF CLASSIFIERS

The rationale for the choice of classifiers may be summarized as follows. MOVIESED was chosen to represent the *media* dimension, primarily because it was substantively related to the question of education for marriage--"Contemporary movies have been an education for our marriage." Results from use of this attitudinal response as classifier may be eventually related to the movie behavioral responses. As reported above, acknowledgement of movie influence was related to discussion of movies and their relation to life and a bit less to the number of movies attended. Furthermore, although there was only a moderate amount of variance on the MOVIESED variable, there was a considerable amount of variance over at least 4 cells, indicating a diversity of opinion and therefore a fruitful question for further analysis of the differences. Further, variation was enhanced because all of the movie variables had at least a six-point measurement scale and thus could be treated as equal interval scales and not dichotomous. MOVIESED further did not relate exclusively to either a reading or television orientation; it had a significant degree of correlation with every other media variable, except NTTV and NTREAD. These correlations from Appendix E-1.1 are arranged here in descending order of amount of shared variance:

|          |       |            |
|----------|-------|------------|
| DISCMQVI | .355  | $p < .000$ |
| PRTV     | -.228 | $p < .001$ |
| PRMAG    | -.227 | $p < .001$ |
| MAGAZINE | .210  | $p < .001$ |
| MOVIATND | .179  | $p < .001$ |
| BOOKS    | -.156 | $p < .001$ |
| PRBOOKS  | -.118 | $p < .009$ |

Certain variables which might have been chosen limited the question too narrowly (e.g., the number of books or articles read on the subject of sex and marriage). Further, previous research by the investigator on this variable had indicated some significant relations which could be expanded into a description of the roles in general which had been influenced by the MOVIESED dimension.

To represent the *parent* dimension as socialization agent, PRNTREL was chosen. PRNTPHON was rejected because of the deviance in the extreme distant group, possibly due to geographic distance.<sup>86</sup> PRNTREL was chosen despite its skewed distribution because it was mostly highly correlated with the greater number of parent variables. In order of descending amounts of shared variance, these correlations were:

|          |             |            |
|----------|-------------|------------|
| PARNTSIG | $r = -.483$ | $p < .000$ |
| PRNTCLOS | $r = -.455$ | $p < .000$ |
| PRNTPHON | $r = .386$  | $p < .000$ |
| PRPARENT | $r = .262$  | $p < .001$ |
| PRNTFACE | $r = .257$  | $p < .001$ |
| MPINDEPN | $r = .197$  | $p < .001$ |

PRNTCLOS was significantly correlated with six of the other parent variables (see Appendix E-1.2) but was rejected because its wording complicated the relation to parents by reference to peers. PARNTSIG had nearly equally significant correlations with six other parent variables but PRNTREL was chosen over it in hopes that the increased

---

<sup>86</sup> See p. 193.

7-point scale would facilitate the comparison of groups with extremely close or distant relations to parents.

The *peer* dimension was represented by FRENDTIM, which had the greatest variance of the peer variables, appearing even to be bi-modal, thus offering wide deviation among groups for comparative study.

NTGROGRP was not used because of the specialized character of the relationships there represented; NTFREDS offered little variance for analysis. The focus on the individual friendship was chosen in preference to the focus on spousal social visits (SOCVISIT) as being a better verbal indicator of the amount of time spent with and presumed influence from a friend. FRENDTIM also exhibited the highest correlation with more other variables in the peer variable set. These correlations are listed here in order of decreasing amount of shared variance:

|          |           |           |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| SOCVISIT | r = .291  | p < .001  |
| PRFREDS  | r = -.214 | p < .001  |
| NTFREDS  | r = .211  | p < .001  |
| NTGROGRP | r = .146  | p < .001  |
| PRDATING | r = -.108 | p < .008. |

There was, of course, an element of arbitrariness about these choices. Extrapolation of findings beyond the substantive content of the statements represented by MOVIESED, PRNTREL, and FRENDTIM to generalized predictions about media, parent and peer influences must be done judiciously. There was variance unaccounted for which might be better accounted for in other models. However, the chosen classifiers did relate significantly to other ways of presenting the media, parent and peer dimensions. Further examination will have to explore the detailed differences among these various ways of classifying. The present exploration, which merely maps out some relations in a field where there has been no prior empirical data, shall proceed on the "best

guess" that use of the three classifiers MOVIESED, PRNTREL, and FRENDTIM is the best way to compare high and low influence along media, parent and peer dimensions.

## Chapter 5

CONFIRMATORY FINDINGS: MEDIA INFLUENCE  
ON MARITAL ROLES

The previous chapter explored relations among the socialization agents and reported a rationale for the choice of ways of classification along three agent dimensions--*media*, to be represented by MOVIESED; *parents*, represented by PRNTREL; and *peers*, represented by FRENDTIM. The present chapter reports in detail the effects which these classifiers had on certain role dimensions--sexual, marital, companionate, parental, leisure, and economic.

While the previous chapter explored many possible relationships in order to generate hypotheses and to experiment with ways of classification, the present chapter reports a trimmed model which tests the hypothesis: media influence marital roles. Interaction effects which support the secondary hypothesis, that media influence interacts with parental and peer influences, are removed from the parsimonious model and reserved for further investigation.

Parsimonious 1-way models in tabular format present for each role dimension variate sets summarizing effects of MOVIESED, PRNTREL, and FRENDTIM on each of the six role dimensions after interaction effects (FPM, FM, PM, FP) have been removed. These models were derived according to the procedures described in Chapter 3 (p. 168ff). For each role dimension, the M-way<sup>1</sup> model is discussed first, then qualified by reference to variables which, though included in the model, were

---

<sup>1</sup> M-way signifies MOVIESED as classifier.

substantively ambiguous, or which, though not included, nevertheless clarify the model, or variables which were excluded due to interaction effects. The M-way model is then compared to the P- and F-way<sup>2</sup> models and the role dimension is summarized, with a view to isolating the most secure effects attributable to MOVIESED. After findings have been presented for all six role dimensions, interaction effects are reported and effects are summarized with respect to role prescriptions.

The report of findings summarized in the tables of 1-way effects (at Appendices F-1 through F-6) includes a multivariate F statistic which indicates significant deviation from the grand mean in at least some classification cells for the variate set taken as a whole. The square of the multiple R indicates for the variate set the amount of variance explained by the way of classification. Each univariate F statistic indicates the total amount of deviation from the grand mean for each variate taken in a univariate analysis of variance using the M-, F-, or P-way of classification. The standardized discriminant function coefficients indicate the relative contribution to the total variance from each variate, taking into account inter-correlations of the variates to one another. Cell means are presented (at Appendices F-7 through F-12) for at least the variates included in the model to indicate trends in the variate score comparing across cells from "very strong agreement" to "very strong disagreement" on MOVIESED, from "unusually close" to "estranged" on PRNTREL, and from "twice a week or more" to "once a year" on FRENDTIM.

To facilitate verbal discussion of these results, the terms "high" or "low" will be applied to MOVIESED, PRNTREL, and FRENDTIM on

---

<sup>2</sup> P-way indicates PRNTREL as classifier; F-way, FRENDTIM.

occasions to indicate the dimension represented by the variable and not the actual classification cell code. This is further facilitated by the tabular presentation of the cell means so that the top of the table column represents high FRENDTIM, PRNTREL, or MOVIESED regardless of the coded cell number.

### SEX ROLES

25% of the variance in the MOVIESED way of classification has been accounted for by the combination of the six sex variates presented in the table at Appendix F-1. It is the highest amount of variance explained for any of the role dimensions.

The M-way effects on sex roles may be summarized as follows. If there was agreement that "Contemporary movies have been an education for our marriage," then there was (in contrast to those who disagreed) a more liberal attitude toward sex (ATTSEX), more discussion of sexual fantasies (DSSXFANT), more agreement that the sexual relationship is the most significant part of the marriage (SEXMOST), even stronger disagreement that people who talk too much about sex are immature (IMMATURE), greater frequency of talk with one's spouse about the sexual relationship and its meaning (FSEXTALK), and more agreement that sex is more enjoyable when one has variety with one's spouse (VARIETY). Cell means for these variates, presented in table F-7, indicated clear, unambiguous trends in the above directions, except that cell M1 ("Very Strongly Agree" on MOVIESED) diverged from expectation rather consistently on ATTSEX, SEXMOST, and VARIETY.<sup>3</sup> This cell with few observations (n=3)

---

<sup>3</sup> VARIETY was less clear in cells M4-M6 and ATTSEX presented a slight deviation in cell M6.



may represent a deviant population which needs clarification in further research.

Four variables were removed from a 10-variate model because none of their standardized discriminant function coefficients exceeded .10. The addition of MAKENJOY, MPROVSEX, DSSEXDES, and SEXCOMM to the six variates reported in table F-1 did not enhance explanatory power (Multivariate  $F(50,1399) = 3.19$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R = .496$ ). These four did not generally change the substantive picture of the effect of media on sexual roles, but they added to the description of that effect. Therefore, if there was agreement on MOVIESED, there was also more hope to make intercourse more enjoyable, more agreement that improving the sexual relationship is the most significant part of a marriage, even more discussion of sexual desires with one's spouse, and more agreement that sexual communication is the most important communication between spouses. Appendix F-1 presents their univariate F's and Appendix F-7, their cell means. These cell means also indicated relatively unambiguous trends for these variates<sup>4</sup> if the deviation of M1 was discounted for MAKENJOY, MPROVSEX, and SEXCOMM.

Although not statistically significant, substantive support for the modeled effects was found in the three other variates for which graphic indication of cell means revealed similar trends.<sup>5</sup> MAXSXTIM

<sup>4</sup> MAKENJOY presented a slight deviation from expectation in cell 6.

<sup>5</sup> Graphic presentation was based on the following cell means:

|           | MOVIESED cell | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
|-----------|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| MAXSXTIM: | Mean          | 4.33 | 4.47 | 3.84 | 3.59 | 3.65 | 3.62 |
|           | S.D.          | 2.08 | 1.55 | 1.46 | 1.33 | 1.38 | 1.61 |
| MPSXPLAY: | Mean          | 1.33 | 1.59 | 1.89 | 2.01 | 2.14 | 1.92 |
|           | S.D.          | 0.58 | 0.61 | 0.79 | 0.71 | 0.93 | 0.97 |
| FOREPLAY: | Mean          | 3.00 | 3.35 | 3.31 | 3.52 | 3.58 | 3.77 |
|           | S.D.          | 2.00 | 1.27 | 1.09 | 1.11 | 1.00 | 1.22 |

(Univariate  $F(5,315) = 1.383, p < .230$ ) indicated that for cells M1 and M2 there was a greater estimate of maximum time spent in sexual activity. If there was agreement on MOVIESED, there was also a trend toward more importance attached to sexual playing together (MPSXPLAY: univariate  $F(5,315) = 1.861, p < .101$ ) and more agreement that foreplay is as enjoyable as climax (FOREPLAY: univariate  $F(5,315) = 1.47, p < .200$ ).

Interaction effects are reported at Appendix G-1. Although XPERIMNT and SEXCOMM were related to MOVIESED,<sup>6</sup> there was no clear univariate relation to PRNTREL and FRENDTIM among any of the interacting variates, except a tendency for the group with the least FRENDTIM to agree more that sexual communication is the most important communication between spouses (SEXCOMM). Low-grade FM interactions for MPSXPLAY and MAXSXTIM were not significant but in multivariate combination created interaction significant at  $p < .03$ . Similarly, PM interactions involving various combinations of FSEX TALK, DSSXFANT, MPROVSEX, MAKENJOY, and MPSXPLAY were significant for the multivariate effects at or near  $p < .05$ , despite univariate F's for the interaction at  $p < .05$ . These effects are merely noted here without report in detail or examination in depth. Interaction effects are further discussed at the conclusion of this chapter.

The high amount (25%) of variance accounted for in MOVIESED by reference to the set of sex role variates was in sharp contrast to the relatively low amount explained by PRNTREL (9%) and FRENDTIM (5.8%)

---

|                                                                |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| <sup>6</sup> XPERIMNT: Univariate $F(1,314) = 0.476, p < .491$ |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| MOVIESED cell                                                  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
| Cell Mean                                                      | 1.00 | 1.18 | 1.57 | 1.81 | 1.77 | 1.67 |
| S.D.                                                           | 0.0  | 0.53 | 0.83 | 0.94 | 0.85 | 1.02 |
| SEXCOMM: Univariate $F(1,314) = 1.024, p < .312$               |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| MOVIESED cell                                                  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
| Cell Mean                                                      | 4.00 | 2.53 | 2.85 | 2.98 | 3.32 | 3.23 |
| S.D.                                                           | 1.73 | 1.13 | 1.06 | 1.22 | 1.30 | 1.42 |

(see Appendix F-1). FSEXTALK was the greatest contributor of variance to both the P- and F-ways of classification. This variable was also significant in the M-way. If there was more time spent with a friend, there was more frequent discussion with spouse of the meaning of the sexual relationship,<sup>7</sup> similar to the M-way effect (if agree on MOVIESED, then high FSEXTALK).<sup>8</sup> The P-way effect on FSEXTALK, however, ran counter to this trend observed in the M- and F- way effects. It was the group most distant from parents (P1, P2, P3) which had the highest scores on FSEXTALK.<sup>9</sup> This same trend, agreement on MOVIESED and much FRENDTIM having a similar effect opposite to close PRNTREL, was observed for DSSXFANT, which was significant in the M-way and F-way effects. Though the cell means for DSSXFANT (at F-7) indicated some ambiguity, the mean of a combined high FRENDTIM group (F1 + F2) would be lower than the mean of a combined low FRENDTIM group (F5 + F6). Thus, the more time spent with a friend, the more discussion of sexual fantasies. For the P-way, however, although not significant ( $F(6,314) = 0.902, p < .493$ ), DSSXFANT's cell means<sup>10</sup> indicated a clear trend that

<sup>7</sup> FSEXTALK cell means:

| <u>FRENDTIM cell</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Cell Mean            | 3.13     | 2.99     | 2.82     | 2.81     | 2.61     | 2.05     |
| S.D.                 | 1.47     | 1.55     | 1.44     | 1.47     | 1.54     | 0.85     |

<sup>8</sup> FSEXTALK cell means:

| <u>MOVIESED cell</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Cell Mean            | 4.00     | 3.35     | 3.15     | 2.72     | 2.42     | 2.62     |
| S.D.                 | 1.73     | 1.80     | 1.56     | 1.42     | 1.34     | 1.29     |

<sup>9</sup> FSEXTALK cell means:

| <u>PRNTREL cell</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>1</u> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Cell Mean           | 2.89     | 2.69     | 3.05     | 2.50     | 3.30     | 3.63     | 6.00     |
| S.D.                | 1.61     | 1.41     | 1.50     | 1.29     | 1.64     | 1.69     | 0.0      |

<sup>10</sup> DSSXFANT cell means:

| <u>PRNTREL cell</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>1</u> |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Cell Mean           | 4.81     | 4.46     | 4.25     | 4.25     | 4.20     | 4.00     | 4.00     |
| S.D.                | 1.31     | 1.42     | 1.51     | 1.50     | 1.75     | 1.51     | 1.41     |

those most distant from parents discussed sexual fantasies more than those closest to parents. In the F-way model, HARDTALK also was affected in the same direction as the M-way.<sup>11</sup> There was less disagreement that sex is difficult to talk about for those (F5, F6) spending the least time with a friend. (The most disagreement on HARDTALK had been associated with the most agreement on MOVIESED.) The F-way cell means<sup>12</sup> for FOREPLAY were ambiguous with a slight trend that those who spent the most time with a friend (F1, F2, F3) would disagree more that FOREPLAY was more important than climax.

In the P-way model, MPSXPLAY was included despite non-significant F, because its discriminant function coefficient indicated that it explained nearly as much as FSEXTALK. Its variance, however, derived from widely discrepant deviations in cells P1 (n=2) and P3 and was substantively uninterpretable. MAXSXTIM was more interpretable with cell means P1 and P3 indicating a greater estimated maximum time ever spent in sexual activity for those most distant from parents. This *low parent* relation associated with a high MAXSXTIM is contrasted to the *high media* influence associated with a high MAXSXTIM.

To summarize the effects of MOVIESED in contrast to the effects of PRNTREL and FRENDTIM, the high amount of total variance accounted for in the MOVIESED model (25%) was further reinforced by highly significant

---

<sup>11</sup> HARDTALK cell means:

| <u>FRENDTIM cell</u> | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Cell Mean            | 5.00 | 5.02 | 4.86 | 4.92 | 4.37 | 4.42 |
| S.D.                 | 1.13 | 1.09 | 1.41 | 1.19 | 1.40 | 1.61 |

<sup>12</sup> FOREPLAY cell means:

| <u>FRENDTIM cell</u> | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Cell Mean            | 3.66 | 3.63 | 3.39 | 3.14 | 3.61 | 3.37 |
| S.D.                 | 1.01 | 1.13 | 1.11 | 1.22 | 1.04 | 1.21 |

univariate F statistics and unambiguous cell mean trends. Generally, the influence of movies on sex roles further emphasized the playful aspects of sexuality already affirmed strongly by the sample, facilitated greater communication about the meaning of the sexual relationship and about one's sexual desires and fantasies, encouraged higher valuation of the sexual relationship per se, and resulted in more work to improve the sexual relationship as a primary goal of the marriage. In short, those who agreed on MOVIESED characterized themselves as more liberal in their sexual attitudes than most people. In marked contrast to the clear effects of MOVIESED, the low variance accounted for by the PRNTREL (9%) and FRENDTIM (5.7%) models was further minimized by low levels of univariate significance and ambiguity of cell mean trends. For the most part only the extreme cells contributed what little variance there was. One trend observed for FSEXTALK and DSSXFANT and to a lesser degree on HARDTALK was that high MOVIESED and high FRENDTIM had the same effects as low PRNTREL. Thus, for some variables in the sexual dimension parental influence was actually countered by the influence of movies and friends. The effect of movie and parental influence was seen to be opposite on MAXSXTIM as well. Such findings might be further clarified by further research on the FPM interactions observed for XPERIMNT, SEXCOMM, and SEXISFUN.

#### MARITAL ROLES

The M-way effects on marital roles, reported in Appendix F-2, may be summarized as follows: If there was agreement on MOVIESED, then (in contrast to those who disagree) there was more agreement that new forms of marriage are required (NEWFORMS), less opposition to marriage

as a trial relationship (TRIALREL) or to living together before marriage (LIVTOGB4), and more agreement that personal growth and change is essential in marriage (PRSNNGROW). The cell means for these variates, reported in Appendix F-8, indicated clear trends, except that one must ignore the deviant cell M1 on TRIALREL, and the trend was less pronounced for PRSNNGROW.

Substantively similar to and statistically highly inter-correlated with the dimensions represented by the above model, DIVORCE, LOVVSLEG, and FIVEYEAR were all significantly related to MOVIESED, but their addition to the 4-variate model (presented at F-2) did not enhance explanatory power (Multivariate  $F(35,1302) = 3.37, p < .001, R = .402$ ). These variates were removed on the basis of their lower standardized discriminant function coefficients, despite the clear trends<sup>13</sup> indicated by their cell means (reported at F-8). If there was more agreement on MOVIESED, then there was less opposition to the expectation of divorce (DIVORCE), more agreement that marriage is a love relationship which does not require a legal contract (LOVVSLEG), and less opposition to the idea of marriage as a five-year renewable contract (FIVEYEAR). One further item was not included in the model because of its relatively lower univariate level of significance. Agreement on MOVIESED was associated with more agreement that a woman should be as free in marriage as a man (WOMNFREE), as indicated by the univariate F and the cell means, especially for M1 and M2.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Trends were clear, ignoring the deviant cell M1 for all three variates.

<sup>14</sup> WOMNFREE: Univariate  $F(5,315) = 2.64, p < .023$

| <u>MOVIESED cell</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Cell Mean            | 1.00     | 1.29     | 1.88     | 2.16     | 2.04     | 1.98     |
| S.D.                 | 0.0      | 0.59     | 1.07     | 1.21     | 0.96     | 1.02     |

The M-way effects of LIVTOGB4, NEWFORMS, and FIVEYEAR must be qualified by the 3-way interaction to which these variates contribute (see Appendix G-2). Also, DSMARIGE and PRSNFILL contributed to the 3-way interaction, despite low univariate levels of significance. Two-way interactions are also reported. MEETNEED and DSMARIGE were removed from the parsimonious model because of their highly significant 2-way interactions.

The significant relationship of MEETNEED to MOVIESED ( $F(5,315) = 4.17, p < .001$ ) must be interpreted in light of the highly significant FM interaction for MEETNEED. DSMARIGE, weakly significant in the 3-way model, demonstrated significant interaction for each 2-way combination, but most especially FP. The interactions reported here require further investigation in order to interpret them accurately. They are further discussed later in this chapter.

The large number of interactions discovered for the marital role dimension indicated that FRENDTIM and PRNTREL did exert their influence by interaction with MOVIESED. But the 1-way effects of PRNTREL and FRENDTIM were practically non-existent, especially in contrast to the high amount of variance accounted for the M-way model (16%). In the P-way model only LOVVSLEG was significantly related to PRNTREL. Those close or unusually close to parents (P6, P7) were most likely to disagree that marriage is a love relationship that requires no legal contract (LOVVSLEG). This is the reverse of the reported M-way effect (if agree on MOVIESED, more agree with LOVVSLEG).

In the F-way model, various combinations of PRSNGROW, LOVVSLEG, NOWEDDNG, CONTRACT, and FIVEYEAR approached multivariate F significant at  $p < .05$ , though no univariate F was significant at  $p < .10$ . Statistics

for the combined set were unobtainable since high correlations among those variates caused exponent overflow which aborted the computer program. The whole set was deleted from the model. However, the F-way cell means<sup>15</sup> for PRSNGROW (esp. F5, F6), CONTRACT (cp. F1, F6), FIVEYEAR (cp. F1, F6), and NOWEDDNG indicated a weak trend similar to strong trends observed for the M-way classification. More FRENDTIM was associated weakly with more agreement that personal growth and change is essential in marriage (PRSNGROW), more disagreement that marriage is first of all a legal contract (CONTRACT), less opposition to a five-year contract (FIVEYEAR), and less opposition to marriage without a wedding (NOWEDDNG). Cell means for LOVVSLEG were too ambiguous to be characterized.

The contribution of MOVIESED to variation in marital role expectations may now be summarized. In general it contributed considerably more than PRNTREL or FRENDTIM, but there was also evidence of considerable interaction among these classifiers. Among the group who agreed that movies have been an education for their marriage, there was less extreme opposition to any non-permanent marital relationship (TRIALREL, DIVORCE, FIVEYEAR), more openness to new forms of marriage (NEWFORMS), a greater willingness to violate legal and social sanctions (LIVTOGB4, LOVVSLEG), and more consideration of personal needs in the

---

<sup>15</sup> F-way cell means:

|          | <u>FRENDTIM cell</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|----------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| PRSNGROW | Cell Mean            | 1.57     | 1.50     | 1.43     | 1.56     | 1.69     | 1.84     |
|          | S.D.                 | 0.68     | 0.63     | 0.57     | 0.68     | 0.80     | 0.83     |
| CONTRACT | Cell Mean            | 5.14     | 4.73     | 4.59     | 4.46     | 4.69     | 4.47     |
|          | S.D.                 | 1.05     | 1.39     | 1.44     | 1.24     | 1.34     | 1.65     |
| FIVEYEAR | Cell Mean            | 4.27     | 4.40     | 4.64     | 4.73     | 4.61     | 5.21     |
|          | S.D.                 | 1.40     | 1.42     | 1.30     | 1.44     | 1.40     | 1.13     |
| NOWEDDNG | Cell Mean            | 3.57     | 3.46     | 3.36     | 3.85     | 3.71     | 4.32     |
|          | S.D.                 | 1.55     | 1.53     | 1.78     | 1.64     | 1.50     | 1.53     |



marital relationship (PRSNGROW, MEETNEED, WOMNFREE). The trimmed model at F-2 represented one variable from each of those expectations, indicating that the parent and peer dimensions which appeared to drop out of the main model must be retained in explaining the variance in marital roles as an interaction of PRNTREL, FRENDTIM and MOVIESED. Apart from the interactions, the parent dimension independently was influential on the question of legal sanctions for marriage (LOVVSLEG), and the peer dimension appeared to make a weak independent contribution to variation in social expectations (NOWEDDNG, CONTRACT), and personal expectations (PRSNGROW), and the expectations of a life-long commitment (FIVEYEAR).

#### COMPANION ROLES

The media effect on companionate roles is expressed in the parsimonious model presented in Appendix F-3. If there was agreement on MOVIESED, then (in contrast to those who disagreed) there was more time spent discussing one's dreams (DSDREAMS), more agreement that the spouses' communication was more open than their parents (OPENCOMM), slightly more interest in talking to improve the marital relationship (NTTLKIMP), more agreement that the spouse is the first to know of one's pain (FRSTTONO), and more agreement that expressing anger is as important as expressing love in a marriage (XPRSANGR).

These findings need to be qualified by reference to the cell means (at F-9). For NTTLKIMP cell M1 contributed the greatest variance, cells M2 and M3 having only slightly lower means than cells M4-M6. For OPENCOMM, XPRSANGR,<sup>16</sup> and FRSTTONO cell M6 deviated from an otherwise

---

<sup>16</sup> For XPRSANGR the deviant group in cell M1 must be ignored in order to indicate the clear trend.

clear trend, so that there was a tendency for the extreme low MOVIESED group to score in the direction established for the high MOVIESED group. A similar pattern was found for MPHLPGRO, which demonstrated rather clearly the same trend, though not statistically significant.<sup>17</sup> The same trend was observed for another not-quite-significant variate, NTTALK.<sup>18</sup> Two other variates--DSDIFEXP and DSDISLIK--were not included in the model because of relatively insignificant univariate F statistics, but their cell means indicated that those who agreed on MOVIESED (esp. M1, M2) were more likely to discuss dislikes about their parents' marital relationship and their own difficult childhood experiences.<sup>19</sup>

A further variate which was significant in the M-way effect, DSDISSAT,<sup>20</sup> was removed from the model because it was affected by the 3-way interaction FPM (see Appendix G-3). It clearly demonstrated a trend toward more discussion of dissatisfactions in the spouse's marital relationship if there was agreement on MOVIESED. Comparison of cell

|    |           |                                      |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|----|-----------|--------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 17 | MPHLPGRO: | Univariate F(5,315) = 1.81, p < .110 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|    |           | <u>MOVIESED cell</u>                 | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|    |           | Cell Mean                            | 1.00     | 1.71     | 1.87     | 2.00     | 2.11     | 1.83     |
|    |           | S.D.                                 | 0.0      | 0.85     | 0.83     | 0.78     | 1.01     | 0.83     |
| 18 | NTTALK:   | Univariate F(5,315) = 1.82, p < .109 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|    |           | <u>MOVIESED cell</u>                 | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|    |           | Cell Mean                            | 1.00     | 1.24     | 1.55     | 1.64     | 1.56     | 1.39     |
|    |           | S.D.                                 | 0.0      | 0.56     | 0.68     | 0.78     | 0.8q     | 0.60     |
| 19 | DSDISLIK: | Univariate F(5,315) = 1.96, p < .085 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|    |           | <u>MOVIESED cell</u>                 | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|    |           | Cell Mean                            | 1.33     | 3.59     | 3.91     | 4.10     | 4.18     | 4.14     |
|    |           | S.D.                                 | 0.58     | 1.77     | 1.85     | 1.61     | 1.57     | 1.76     |
|    | DSDIFEXP: | Univariate F(5,315) = 1.79, p < .115 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|    |           | <u>MOVIESED cell</u>                 | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|    |           | Cell Mean                            | 1.33     | 3.00     | 3.40     | 3.49     | 3.65     | 3.58     |
|    |           | S.D.                                 | 0.58     | 1.41     | 1.42     | 1.51     | 1.49     | 1.75     |
| 20 | DSDISSAT: | Univariate F(5,315) = 3.39, p < .005 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|    |           | <u>MOVIESED cell</u>                 | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|    |           | Cell Mean                            | 1.33     | 2.77     | 3.21     | 3.70     | 3.65     | 3.71     |
|    |           | S.D.                                 | 0.58     | 1.72     | 1.59     | 1.39     | 1.58     | 1.45     |

means for the extremes of DSDISSAT in the P- and F-ways of classification<sup>21</sup> indicated a trend in the same direction. There was more discussion of dissatisfactions if there was more agreement on MOVIESED, and if there was more time spent with a friend, and if there was more closeness to parents. But these relationships must be qualified by further examination of the interaction effects, a task reserved for a later investigation and discussed later in this chapter. DSDISLIK contributed little to the 3-way model, but it was involved in an FM interaction, contributing more to the total variation (according to its discriminant function coefficient) than the low grade univariate F would indicate. NTTALK and MPHLPGRO also contributed to a significant FM interaction.

Comparing the effect of MOVIESED to the effect of PRNTREL (see F-3 and F-9), there was an opposite effect for the M- and the P-ways of classification. While those agreeing with MOVIESED (M1, M2) also agreed more strongly on OPENCOMM, those closest to parents (P6, P7) agreed less strongly that their communication was more open than their parents'. This same difference in the M- and the P-way effects was seen in DSDISLIK where the cell means clearly indicated that the persons closest to parents were *least likely* to discuss their dislikes about their parents' relationship (if agree on MOVIESED, then *most discussion* of dislikes). On the other hand, for NTTALK, the weak P-way effect, with cell P7 contributing the primary variance (cp. P2, P7), was similar to

---

|                                                              |               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| <sup>21</sup> DSDISSAT: Univariate F(6,314) = 1.06, p < .385 |               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                                              | PRNTREL cell  | 7    | 6    | 5    | 4    | 3    | 2    | 1    |
|                                                              | Cell Mean     | 3.41 | 3.58 | 3.21 | 3.60 | 3.80 | 2.63 | 4.00 |
|                                                              | S.D.          | 1.44 | 1.58 | 1.45 | 1.55 | 1.99 | 1.41 | 1.41 |
| DSDISSAT: Univariate F(5,315) = 1.75, p < .124               |               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                                              | FRENDTIM cell |      | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
|                                                              | Cell Mean     |      | 3.23 | 3.44 | 3.63 | 3.14 | 3.76 | 4.00 |
|                                                              | S.D.          |      | 1.66 | 1.43 | 1.64 | 1.50 | 1.38 | 1.70 |

the weak M-way effect. Both those who very strongly agreed on MOVIESED and those who were unusually close to parents were more interested in talking about anything and everything with their spouse (NTTALK).

The model presented (at F-3) to represent the F-way effects on the companionate roles is not complete. NTTLKIMP (univariate  $F(5,315) = 2.18, p < .056$ ) contributed greatly to the model as indicated by its discriminant function coefficients in every 3-variate combination with MPHLPGRO, XPRSANGR, and MPFRETIM. But statistics for the 4-variate set could not be obtained due to the high inter-correlations among the four, causing exponent overflow error to abort the computer program. XPRSANGR was retained because it was least correlated with the other variates in the set and thus added a unique dimension. The presented model maximized p levels for the univariate set and left the multiple R virtually unchanged from the highest multiple R (.268) obtained for any set of three from among these four. MPFRETIM was a dimension not associated with MOVIESED, indicating that persons spending more time with a friend attached less importance to spending free time with their spouse. The other variates in this set varied in a direction similar to the direction attributable to the MOVIESED effect. Those who spent the least time with a friend were less strong in their endorsement of expressing anger (XPRSANGR), and were least interested in talking to improve their relationship with their spouse (NTTLKIMP) and attached less importance to their spouse helping them to grow (MPHLPGRO).

To summarize, three variates in the P-way model explained only about 10% of the variance in PRNTREL, slightly better than the five variates which accounted for only 10% of the MOVIESED variance. Only about 7% of the variance in FRENDTIM was accounted for, which might be

improved slightly by the addition of NTTLKIMP to the model. One reason for the lack of explanatory power in the companionate dimension may be the relatively low levels of variance in the dimension as a whole. There was little variation in the expectation that the spouse will be a companion. The only variance accounted for on the general companionship expectation was that more time with a friend deemphasizes the free time spent with one's spouse. Regarding the amount of communication in general, the degree of interest in talking with spouse was an effect of interaction of MOVIESED and FRENDTIM, as well as an independent effect in which those unusually close to parents were more interested in talking with their spouse. MOVIESED had significant effect on the variates indicating a depth level of communication between spouses regarding their relationship--open communication (OPENCOMM), talking to improve their marital relationship (NTTLKIMP), expressing anger as well as love (XPRSANGR), and a weak tendency to place more importance on one's spouse helping in one's growth (MPHLPGRO). MOVIESED also influenced the variates representing the most intimate levels of personal sharing--more discussion of dreams (DSDREAMS), more likelihood that spouse is first to know of pain (FRSTTONO), and a weak tendency to discuss difficult childhood experiences more (DSDIFEXP). The parent dimension, in contrast, was primarily related to those aspects which were directly related to parents--more open communication than parents (OPENCOMM) and dislikes about the parents' relationship (DSDISLIK). The peer dimension related to the self-reflective communication of the spouses--more interest in talking to improve the marital relationship (NTTLKIMP), in the spouse's helping me to grow (MPHLPGRO), in expressing anger as well as love (XPRSANGR)--although the importance attached to "my spouse's helping

me to grow" is the result of an interaction of FRENDTIM and MOVIESED. The focus on the dissatisfactions of the marital relationship cannot be examined without taking account of the three-way interaction of MOVIESED, PRNTREL, and FRENDTIM. Many of the associations reported here were not as strong as for the marital and sexual role dimensions, depending more on deviations of the extreme groups. The total variance accounted for was small, but there was evidence that media do influence roles, and in interaction with parents and peers.

#### PARENTAL ROLES

The model for the M-way effect on parental roles is presented in Appendix F-4. The variables in the model all relate to attitudes which have received considerable publicity in the popular media. In contrast to disagreement, agreement on MOVIESED was associated with a more liberal attitude toward the feminist movement (ATTFEM), more agreement that natural childbirth is more rewarding (NATUBRTH), a more liberal attitude regarding abortion (ATTABORT), more agreement that the population crisis is an important factor in decisions regarding family size (POPUCRIS), and more agreement that one should adopt children after one has two (ADOPTKID).

The M-way cell means (at F-10) for all of these variates indicated trends in the directions specified, except that the deviant cell M1 must be ignored for ADOPTKID, ATTABORT, and NATUBRTH. The trends were not as dramatically clear as for the sexual and marital role dimensions, however.

There were no 3-way interactions and only relatively weak 2-way interactions. An FM interaction is reported in table G-4 to which

BRESTFED contributed the most. BRESTFED also contributed to a PM interaction of low-grade significance. There were no clear 1-way relationships between any classifier and BRESTFED, and the interpretation of the interaction effects must be left for further investigation. TWOCHILD contributed nearly as much as BRESTFED to the PM model, though even in combination the multivariate F was not very significant compared to previously reported interactions. Further discussion of interaction follows later.

The P-way model is reported at Appendix F-4. In combination, three variates only accounted for about 7% variance in PRNTREL. The four variates MPEDUCAT, RAISKIDS, TWOCHILD, and KIDSWANT all contributed to the model and were highly inter-correlated with one another. But statistics for their combination could not be obtained due to exponent overflow error and an aborted computer run. Substantively, KIDSWANT and TWOCHILD are similar dimensions and the omission of one or the other does not affect the model. KIDSWANT, however, presented a clearer trend in its cell means and was thus more readily interpretable. In fact, KIDSWANT was the only clearly interpretable relationship in the P-way model.<sup>22</sup> Those closer to parents wanted more children of their own (but the cell mean for P1, n=2, must be ignored as clearly deviant). The deviance in MPEDUCAT was contributed almost entirely by cells P1 and P2 and that in entirely different directions. RAISKIDS was likewise uninterpretable, its deviations from the grand mean occurring almost entirely in Cells P1 and P4, again in opposite directions. TWOCHILD

---

<sup>22</sup> KIDSWANT: Univariate  $F(6,314) = 1.97, p < .069$

| PRNTREL cell | 7    | 6    | 5    | 4    | 3    | 2    | 1    |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Cell Mean    | 3.76 | 3.37 | 3.53 | 3.38 | 3.10 | 2.88 | 4.00 |
| S.D.         | 1.09 | 0.81 | 0.99 | 0.77 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.0  |

might be interpretable as those most distant from parents (P1, P2) disagreeing most that two children is the right number for a happy family (presumably wanting fewer children).

In the F-way model (at F-4 and F-10) the greatest contribution was the variance in RAISKIDS. Those who spent more time with a friend agreed less that raising the children is the biggest task in a marriage. Those who spent the least time with a friend were the most conservative in their attitude toward the feminist movement which was independently the same direction of influence of MOVIESED, (if more MOVIESED, then more liberal).

In summary, the parsimonious models presented here have explained about 12% of the variance in MOVIESED, about 8% in FRENDDIM, and only about 7% in PRNTREL by reference to parental role variables. MOVIESED clearly related to items which reflect issues which have been subjects of mass media publicity (feminist movement, natural childbirth, abortion, population crisis). But the model for PRNTREL reduced to only one variable with a clear relationship, the number of children wanted. The relative salience of the marital and the parental roles was not influenced by any of the classifiers in the model. Thus, the reported ambiguity regarding the focus on the family was not explained by reference to parent, peer, or media socialization agents. The attitude toward one current issue, the feminist movement seemed to be independently affected by both PRNTREL and MOVIESED, but especially by MOVIESED, which also influenced variables having to do with the choice of natural childbirth (NATUBRTH), or the choice of aborting birth (ATTABORT). There was only a low-grade FM interaction on NATUBRTH to qualify this finding. The importance attached to having children and the amount of discussion



of when to have children were not affected by any of the classifiers. Attitudes about family size were affected by MOVIESED with more attention to the population crisis (POPUCRIS) and more acceptance of the expectation that one will adopt children after the first one or two (ADOPTKID). The actual number of children wanted, however, was significantly related to parental closeness and there was a weak interaction of PRNTREL and MOVIESED on the normative expectation of two children. The importance attached to raising children was related to FRENDTIM more than to MOVIESED, and whether breast feeding is preferable to bottle feeding was the result of interaction of MOVIESED with FRENDTIM and independently with PRNTREL.

#### LEISURE ROLES

The effects of the MOVIESED variable on the leisure roles are summarized in Appendix F-5, with the accompanying cell means at F-11. If there was agreement on MOVIESED, then in comparison to those disagreeing there was more discussion of how to spend money on leisure activities (DSLEISMN), less disagreement that social and recreational activities are a big budget item (SOCBUDGT), and a greater percentage of the couple's budget reported spent on social and recreational items (PBUDGSOC). There was less interest in artistic and creative expression (NTARTEXP), though slightly more interest in painting (NTPAINT) and in hobbies (NTHOBBY), and more agreement that making your own fun is superior to buying it (MAKEFUN).

These effects must be qualified, however, by reference to the cell means indicating comparative effects and trends. In the model PBUDGSOC got a great deal of credit through the discriminant function

coefficient because it was highly correlated with DSLEISMN and SOCBUDGT. But the trend indicated by the means for PBUDGSOC was unclear.<sup>23</sup> DSLEISMN and SOCBUDGT were needed in the model, despite low discriminant function coefficients, in order to clarify the dimension represented by PBUDGSOC. There was a clear linear trend on DSLEISMN toward more discussion if more agreement on MOVIESED, and a nearly linear trend on SOCBUDGT so that if more agreed on MOVIESED, then there was more tendency for social and recreational items to be a big budget item. The effect on NTARTEXP was most indicated by comparison of the extreme difference of cells M1 and M6, although cells M2 and M5 weakly indicated the same direction of influence. MAKEFUN must be qualified by the indication that only the means for cells M1 and M2 were clearly lower. For NTHOBBY and NTPAINT, cell M2 had a clearly lower mean, but the deviant cell M1 and the similarity of cell M3 to M4-M6 left an ambiguity to the interpretation of this data.

The only interaction effect reported at Appendix G-5 for the leisure dimension was that for NTNITCLB.<sup>24</sup> The M-way cell means indicated a clear trend in the direction of more interest in night clubs if more agreement on MOVIESED, but this association did not appear statistically as significant and must be further conditioned by the three-way interaction of PRNTREL, FRENDTIM, and MOVIESED.

---

<sup>23</sup> The interpretation of PBUDGSOC in the opening paragraph of this section was based on the assumption of a linear relationship from a low mean (high percentage of budget) at M1 to a high mean (low percentage) at M6, and cell M2 clearly deviant. But the relationship could also be interpreted as curvilinear with cell M1 deviant.

<sup>24</sup> NTNITCLB: Univariate  $F(5,315) = 1.42, p < .218$

| <u>MOVIESED cell</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Cell means           | 4.00     | 4.24     | 4.36     | 4.55     | 4.72     | 4.83     |
| S.D.                 | 1.00     | 1.35     | 1.39     | 1.27     | 1.19     | 1.26     |

In the P-way model (at F-5 and F-11) for NTDOITUR and NTDINOUT the cells P1 and P2 were the prime sources of variance, this group distant from parents also having much less interest in do-it-yourself activities and dining out. SOCVISIT, though having only a very low grade univariate F significance, was included since the discriminant function coefficient indicated it contributes more than MAKEFUN to the model. Also, the cell means indicated that clearly the 3 groups most distant from parents visited other couples socially much less frequently. MAKEFUN was uninterpretable by a linear trend and its discriminant coefficient indicated that it did not add much to the explanation of variance.

The F-way model variates at (at F-5 and F-11) all may be directly compared to the P- or M-way models. As with the group most distant from parents, those spending the least time with a friend (F4, F5, F6) also had the least social visits with another couple (SOCVISIT). There was least interest in art experience (NTARTEXP) for the two cells (F5, F6) representing the *least time* with a friend, opposite the effect of MOVIESED (if *more* MOVIESED, then less NTARTEXP). In the same direction of effect as for MOVIESED, however, interest in hobbies (NTHOBBY) was least for the least FRENDTIM group (F6). For the least FRENDTIM group (F5, F6) there was less disagreement that they prefer commercialized entertainment (NTERTAIN). Though not having a direct parallel in the M-way effects, this was similar to the effects of MOVIESED on MAKEFUN (less FRENDTIM, more preference for commercialized entertainment; less agree on MOVIESED, less preference for making one's own fun rather than buying it).

In summary, the clear trends observed for the sexual and the

marital roles were not found. Only DSLEISMN was unambiguously related to MOVIESED. All other relations had to be qualified by indicating the extreme groups which indicated the deviation from the grand mean, rather than indicating a clear trend for the cell means taken together. Only 11% of the variance in MOVIESED and in FRENDTIM was accounted for by the respective models, and PRNTREL's model was even less explanatory(7%). While both the P- and the F-way effects related to the number of social visits, the M-way of classification did not affect SOCVISIT. MOVIESED effects primarily had to do with money, with the reasonable finding that agreement on MOVIESED was associated with spending more on social and recreational budget. There was also a trend, however, for slightly more interest in certain aspects of self-expression (painting and hobbies), a relation made ambiguous by indication of less interest in artistic and creative expression. Interest in travel and camping, and total times out with one's spouse were not influenced by any of the classifiers of the main model.

#### ECONOMIC ROLES

The effects of the MOVIESED variable on the economic roles are summarized in Appendix F-6, with the accompanying cell means at F-12. Agreement on MOVIESED (in contrast with disagreement) was associated with greater agreement that the husband and wife should both contribute to the family income (HWFAMINC), and greater importance to the wife having a career (MPWIFCAR).

These effects were not as clearly indicated by the cell means. Discounting deviant cell M1, the directions indicated by cell means for HWFAMINC and MPWIFCAR were further corroborated by the direction of cell

mean trends for MPCOOK and WIFEEARN. Agreement on MOVIESED was associated with more agreement that the wife can contribute to the family income even earning more than her husband without damage, more importance attached to the wife having a career, and less importance attached to the wife's being a good cook and housekeeper.

Interaction effects are reported at Appendix G-6 and discussed in greater detail later in this chapter. MANYCAR was involved in a three-way interaction at  $p < .025$ . M-way cell means (discounting cell M1) for MANYCAR<sup>25</sup> and CHANGCAR<sup>26</sup> indicated that *disagreement* on MOVIESED was associated with less strong expectation that a change in career is to be expected and that one would have many careers in one's lifetime. FM interactions involved MANYCAR and MPSAVING. Cell means indicated that those who agreed on MOVIESED rated adequate savings and investment<sup>27</sup> as slightly less important than those who disagreed. PM interactions involved MANYCAR, DSFURNIT, and WIFEEARN. FP interactions involved DSFURNIT and OWNHOME.

In the P-way model, only MPCOOK remained. Thus, as the cell means reported at F-12 indicate, those closest to parents placed more importance on the wife's being a good cook and housekeeper, just the

---

|    |           |                                        |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|----|-----------|----------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 25 | MANYCAR:  | Univariate $F(5,315) = 1.79, p < .115$ |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|    |           | <u>MOVIESED cell</u>                   | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|    |           | Cell Mean                              | 3.33     | 2.77     | 2.65     | 2.95     | 3.12     | 3.21     |
|    |           | S.D.                                   | 2.52     | 1.48     | 1.13     | 1.29     | 1.26     | 1.64     |
| 26 | CHANGCAR: | Univariate $F(5,315) = 1.61, p < .156$ |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|    |           | <u>MOVIESED cell</u>                   | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|    |           | Cell Mean                              | 3.00     | 2.65     | 2.58     | 2.69     | 2.84     | 3.08     |
|    |           | S.D.                                   | 2.65     | 1.12     | 1.02     | 1.02     | 1.13     | 1.23     |
| 27 | MPSAVING: | Univariate $F(5,315) = 1.91, p < .092$ |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|    |           | <u>MOVIESED cell</u>                   | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> |
|    |           | Cell Mean                              | 3.33     | 2.71     | 2.52     | 2.52     | 2.40     | 2.14     |
|    |           | S.D.                                   | 2.52     | 1.31     | 1.08     | 0.90     | 0.94     | 0.89     |

opposite effect as those who agreed on MOVIESED. Though WIFEARN was not significant in the P-way model, extreme cell means P1 and P7 are in opposite directions from the M-way model, with those closest to parents, and those disagreeing on MOVIESED being least agreeable that the wife can earn as much as her husband.

The F-way model retained the four variables reported at F-6, with cell means reported at F-12. Those who spent more time with a friend placed less importance on labor saving devices (MPLABSAV), less importance on the husband having a steady, well-paying job (MPHUSJOB), less importance on the wife's being a good cook and housekeeper (MPCOOK) and less importance on having a comfortable home (MPHOUSE). Cell means were somewhat ambiguous but the above indicated directions were derived by attention to contrasts of the extreme cells (F1 and F6), with only a cell or two in each instance not fitting well into the trend indicated by the direction determined from the extremes.

In summary, the F-way model accounted for most variance in economic roles, with about 9.6% of variance in FRENDTIM accounted for by reference to four economic role variables. Discriminant function coefficients indicate that two of these (MPCOOK and MPMOUSE) contributed little independent information. The former was highly related to the variable MPHUSJOB and the latter to MPLABSAV. Thus, more time spent with a friend was related to less importance attached to laborsaving appliances (and a comfortable house) and to the husband's job (and the wife's role as housekeeper). The P-way model reduced to only one effective variable, with those closest to parents placing more importance on the wife's being a good cook and housekeeper. MOVIESED was only influential as a source of variation for two variables, both related.

Only 5.3% of variance in economic roles was attributable to MOVIESED. Though there were other relationships which will be noted in the interactions, the most solid finding was that agreement on MOVIESED was associated with greater openness to the wife's having a career and contributing to the family income.

#### SUMMARY OF ONE-WAY EFFECTS OF "MOVIESED"

To summarize the results of the parsimonious model just presented, the primary hypothesis of the investigation was confirmed. At least when MOVIESED was used to classify media influence,<sup>28</sup> "Media influence marital roles." When the effects of 2- and 3-way interactions have been removed and error effects have been allowed for, MOVIESED still exhibited significant effects for all six role dimensions. In all, out of 109 variates representing the 6 role dimensions, 29 were included in the parsimonious model as significantly influenced by MOVIESED. Another 7 variates might have been included but were dropped from the model because they represented overlapping dimensions within the sexual and marital role expectations. Even allowing for the substantive ambiguity of some of the statistically significant variates included in the model, the broad hypothesis of media influence on marital roles was confirmed.

Using percentage of variance accounted for as chief indicator, supplemented by clarity of cell mean trends, the greatest effects attributable to MOVIESED were in the sexual (25%) and marital (16%) role dimensions, with less effect on companionate (10%), parental (12%), and leisure (11%) dimensions, and least effect on economic roles (5.3%).

---

<sup>28</sup> The limitations of the above model will be discussed in the final chapter of conclusions, recommendations, and implications.

In comparison with the P-way and F-ways of classification, the M-way was clearly most explanatory in the sexual role dimension (where FRENDDIM's usefulness was especially low), in the marital roles (where both FRENDDIM and PRNTREL dropped out of the one-way model), and in the parental roles (where the influence of PRNTREL<sup>29</sup> was especially low). In comparison to P- and F-ways of classifying economic roles, the M-way was least significant.

These findings will be summarized at the end of this chapter by indicating the relative strength of the M-way effect on particular role prescriptions within the broad role dimensions. First, interaction effects are reported in detail and summarized.

#### INTERACTIONS

The tables at Appendices G-1 through G-6 summarize the interaction effects. These were arrived at through the multiple criteria reported at p.165f. Although many of the reported variates did exhibit one-way effects, most were removed from the 1-way models because significant interactions indicated that their variations could not be explained simply as 1-way effects, but as a result of the interactions of parents, peers, and/or media. These variables reported here as interaction effects support the hypothesis, "Media influence marital roles in interaction with parents and peers." They explain variation in marital roles by reference to more than one of the socialization agents--media, parents, or peers. Three- and 2-way interaction effects within each of the six role dimensions are reported, then summarized with

---

<sup>29</sup> The PRNTREL model included only 1 useful variate each in the sexual, marital, parental, and economic role dimensions.



reference to role positions and expectations.

### Sexual Roles

For the sexual roles, on which there had been considerable 1-way effect from MOVIESED, and very little for the P- and F-ways of classification, three variates--EXPERIMNT, SEXCOMM, SEXISFUN--in combination explained 78.3% of variance for the 3-way interaction (see Appendix G-1). EXPERIMNT is clearly the most useful variate due to its combined significance level ( $p < .001$ ) and its standardized discriminant function coefficient (.998). SEXISFUN was included in the model, though it was marginal, having a lower significance level ( $p < .055$ ) and only about one-fifth of the explanatory power of EXPERIMNT (standardized discriminant function coefficient = .202). No 2-way effects were reported, since no univariate F was significant at  $p < .05$ . However, various combinations of several variates<sup>30</sup> created multivariate F's ranging from  $p < .027$  to  $p < .075$ . Standardized discriminant function coefficients indicated that some of these variates having relatively low significance levels had as much or more explanatory power as variates with higher significance levels. The complexity and marginal significance of these relations make it unadvisable to report and explain them in detail here. Further investigation is required into interaction effects. But the variates comprising the weak PM interaction (again, in order of decreasing univariate F's), the variates were MPSXPLAY and MAXSXTIM. The 3-way interactions related to the spouse-to-spouse position with the expectation of sexual communication, and an

---

<sup>30</sup> Univariate F's ranged mostly from  $p < .071$  to  $p < .165$  (with one at  $p < .369$ ).

experimenting playful sexual relationship. But the FPM interactions also affected the couples' position with respect to societal expectations, reflecting basic social value orientation. The language of the statements coded as XPERIMNT, SEXCOMM, and SEXISFUN was freighted with goal-orientation and value connotations--"a couple *ought to be* free to experiment sexually," sex is the "*most important* communication," "sex is *primarily* fun." The descriptive data on role dimensions indicated that the sample was highly open in its communication about sex and strongly affirmed playful sexual activity. But the statements SEXCOMM and SEXISFUN, which relate to the value primacy of *sexual* communication or of sex as *play*, elicited only mild agreement. Expectations which were highly affirmed and which were highly influenced by MOVIESED, were moderated when they were stated as basic value orientations. These value-laden statements exhibited the most interaction of media influence with parent and peer influences. EXPERIMNT may have further reflected this concern about basic values, since some respondents called attention (through marginal notation or underlining) to the phrase "within the marriage," thus indicating that they evidently read "experimentation" as connotating "extra-marital" sexual activity. Further corroboration of the interaction effects on attitudes toward sexual play was found in the weak 2-way effects reported above. The importance of sexual playing together figured in both parent-movie and friend-movie interactions. The interaction of movies especially with parent influence on matters of basic values was indicated, at least weakly, by the PM interactions MAKENJOY<sup>31</sup> and MPROVSEX,<sup>32</sup> which indicated the degree to which a couple

---

<sup>31</sup> " I *hope to continually* make intercourse more enjoyable" (italics mine).

<sup>32</sup> "Improving our sexual relationship is a *primary goal* in our marriage" (italics mine).

works at their playful sexual relationship.

### Marital Roles

Although the 1-way effects model for PRNTREL was reduced to only one variable, and for FRENDTIM was virtually eliminated, the high amount of variance attributable to MOVIESED must be interpreted in light of the large number of interaction effects, both 3- and 2-way. As summarized at Appendix G-2, three variates--LIVTOGB4, NEWFORMS, FIVEYEAR--combined to explain 66% of variance in the FPM interaction,  $R = .812$  with a multivariate  $F$  significant at  $p < .007$ . The addition of two more variates--DSMARIGE and PRSNFILL--which did not have a univariate  $F$  significant at  $p < .05$ , nevertheless enhanced explanatory power, with the five-variate combination accounting for 82% of variance,  $R = .905$ , multivariate  $F$  significant at  $p < .017$ . Discriminant function coefficients indicated that these latter two variates were roughly half as useful as NEWFORMS and FIVEYEAR, although LIVTOGB4 lost some of its explanatory power because of its inter-correlations with DSMARIGE and PRSNFILL. Many of these five variates also figured in 2-way interactions, including FIVEYEAR (PM), LIVTOGB4 (FP), NEWFORMS (PM, FP), and DSMARIGE (FM, PM, FP). MEETNEED also contributed to the FM interaction, with a highly significant univariate  $F$  ( $p < .004$ ). Multivariate  $F$ 's have not been computed for the variates listed in the 2-way models. Sometimes variates which were not significant at  $p < .05$  accounted for as much variance as ones that were included (according to the discriminant function coefficients). These complex relationships must be reserved for further investigation at a later time.

Every marital role position and every role prescription figured in at least one of the interacting variates. Relations of spouses to one

another are defined by reference to expectations which related the couple to the society at large. Both 2- and 3-way interactions were needed to explain variations in the expectation of permanence (not a five year contract), that new forms of marriage are required, and that social sanctions may be violated (by living together before marriage). Role expectations relating spouses to their own personhood also must be explained by reference to the interactions, both in the expectation that marriage functions to increase one's personal fulfillment, and that it is valid only when it meets the needs of both spouses. The extent of discussion of the meaning of marriage also must be accounted for in terms of interaction effects.

The ambiguity revealed by descriptive data for many of the marital role variables must be further clarified by reference to the interactions of parents, peers, and media. The sample mildly *disagreed* that "the *primary* function of marriage is to increase my personal fulfillment" (italics added), but it mildly *agreed* that "Marriage is only valid as long as it meets the needs of both spouses."

Though the sample mildly disagreed with both NEWFORMS and LIVTOGB4, there was considerable spread on both variates, with the mode actually at mildly agree.

### Companionate Roles

Interactions for the companionate roles are reported at G-3. In the 3-way model two variates--DSDISSAT, DSDISLIK--accounted for 70.9% of variance,  $R = .842$ , multivariate  $F$  is significant at  $p < .001$ . Discriminant function coefficients indicated that DSDISLIK is only about one quarter as useful as DSDISSAT, both highly correlated and representing

similar substantive dimensions. Another set of five variates included the two above plus MPHLPGRO, DSDIFEXP, and NTTALK (in order to descending discriminant function coefficients), all having univariate F's significant at  $p < .135$  to  $p < .169$ . The 5-variate set, however, did not appreciably increase the explained variance, accounting for only 71%,  $R = .864$ , multivariate F significant at  $p < .004$ . When DSDISSAT was removed from the model, then the chief credit for the interaction shifted from DSDISSAT to DSDISLIK, as indicated by the highest discriminant function coefficient.

Marginal 2-way interactions for PM (FRSTTONO, univariate F significant at  $p < .075$ ) and FP (NTTALK, univariate F significant at  $p < .098$ ) were not reported in table format since they were more useful in the 1-way models and their interactions were not highly significant. The 2-way FM model was reduced by eliminating NTTLKIMP through the multiple criteria of univariate F ( $p < .074$ ) and having a very low discriminant function coefficient. Thus, the FM interaction represents two of the variates--NTTALK, MPHLPGRO--which were marginally related to the 3-way interactions and one which was included in the 3-way model, DSDISLIK.

The variates included in the 3-way interaction represented the spouse-to-spouse position with the expectation that there should be open communication. The interaction of parents, peers, and movies must be taken into account to predict the degree of discussion of dissatisfactions in the marital relationship, and (to a lesser degree) of the dislikes in one's parents' marital relationship. The FM interaction was a necessary explanation of variance in the role expectation that there would be a great deal of interest in communicating with one's spouse about anything, and that one's spouse should help one to grow.

### Parental Roles

No 3-way interactions were found in the parental role variates. BRESTFED participated in both FM and PM interactions. The FM interaction model included NATUBRTH, which despite a significance level  $p < .082$ , did contribute about a quarter as much as BRESTFED, for a total of 53% of variance accounted for,  $R = .730$ ,  $p < .007$ . In the PM interaction model, TWOCHILD contributed nearly as much as BRESTFED, despite its low significance ( $p < .071$ ), for a total of 44% of variance accounted for,  $R = .661$ ,  $p < .02$ .

The role positions affected relate the spouse to the child and to societal expectations. Breast feeding, and natural childbirth are related to the element of choice, or personal fulfillment, in child rearing. TWOCHILD relates to the size of the family.

### Leisure Roles

As reported in Appendix G-5 only one three-way interaction--NTNITCLB--was detected in the leisure variate set. This positions the marital couple in relation to one another, with the expectation that they will find commercialized entertainment.

FM and PM interactions were not reported at G-5 because the univariate F's for the variates were not significant at  $p < .05$ . Nevertheless, in an FM interaction, NTERTAIN and NTNITCLB combined to yield a multivariate  $F(18,50) = 1.91$ ,  $p < .037$ ,  $R = .686$ . Both variates related to the expectation of commercialized entertainment. A PM interaction with multivariate  $F = p < .034$ ,  $R = .619$ , resulted from the combination of DSLEISMN and NTPAINT, *the first* of which also related to the expectation of commercial entertainment.

### Economic Roles

The table in Appendix G-6 summarizes the interactions for the economic roles. Although in the 3-way model, MANYCAR, OWNHOME, and MPSAVING in combination accounted for 67% of variance,  $R = .820$ , OWNHOME and MPSAVING were eliminated from the 3-way model, despite discriminant function coefficients indicating that they were over one-half and over one-third (respectively) as useful in the model as MANYCAR, because of their low significance levels ( $p < .149$ ,  $p < .102$ ) and their greater usefulness in the 2-way models. MANYCAR is thus the only variable in the 3-way interaction, and it also figures in the FM and the PM models.

Multivariate F's for the 2-way models have not been computed, though the univariate F's indicated significant interactions in FM for MPSAVING and MANYCAR, in PM for MANYCAR, DSFURNIT, and WIFEEARN, and in FP for DSFURNIT and OWNHOME.

The role positions primarily represent the spouses in relation to the larger economic world outside the marriage, although WIFEEARN has to do with the spouses' positions to one another relative to the role of breadwinner. The expectation that was most affected by the 3-way interaction was that of career mobility, an expectation also figuring in the FM and PM interactions.

Expectations which were affected by the interactions were these: for FM, career mobility and economic security (importance of savings); for PM, career mobility, consumer interest (furniture discussion), and husband as breadwinner; and for FP, consumer interest (furniture discussion and home ownership).

### Summary

The secondary hypothesis, "Media influence marital roles in interaction with parents and peers" is supported. Two- or 3-way interactions were discovered for every role dimension, although some of the firmest interactions were found for the role dimensions which had been most influenced by MOVIESED in 1-way effects, sexual and marital roles.

Conclusions and recommendations based on interaction effects are reported in the final chapter. Only for the parental dimension was no 3-way interaction detected. One FPM interaction was significant at  $p < .001$  (XPERIMNT), another at  $p < .01$  (DSDISSAT), and 7 more at  $p < .05$  (SEXCOMM, SEXISFUN, LIVTOGB4, NEWFORMS, FIVEYEAR, NTNITCLB, MANYCAR). An additional five variates, though marginal in significance level, nevertheless did enhance explanatory power somewhat (DSMARIGE, PRSNFILL, DSDISLIK, OWNHOME, MPSAVING). The nine most clearly indicated 3-way interaction effects have been graphically presented in order to detect trends explaining the nature of the interaction and allowing prediction of the role dimensions given information about media, parents, and peers. The hypotheses generated in such explanation are reserved for the final chapter.

Some roles in all but two (sexual, leisure) of the role dimensions must be explained as the result of interactions of MOVIESED and FRENDTIM. MEETNEED, BRESTFED, and MPSAVING were significant at  $p < .01$ , and DSMARIGE, NTTALK, MPHLPGRO, and MANYCAR were all significant at  $p < .05$ . An additional two, DSDISLIK and NATUBRTH, enhanced explanatory power despite relatively low significance levels.



Only roles in the marital, parental and economic dimensions must be considered as 2-way interactions of PRNTREL and MOVIESED. Two of these, MANYCAR and DSFURNIT, had univariate F levels of  $p < .01$ . Five had univariate F's of  $p < .05$ : NEWFORMS, FIVEYEAR, DSMARIGE, BRESTFED, WIFEEARN. An additional variate--TWOCHILD--was reported, though only marginally related, since it enhanced the explanation of the 2-way interaction.

#### ROLE PRESCRIPTIONS: A SUMMARY OF EFFECTS

Thus far, the parsimonious model of MOVIESED influence on the role dimensions has been presented and related to influence of FRENDDIM and PRNTREL. Interactions have been reported and removed from the 1-way models. This chapter summary will discuss specific role definitions (see p.63f) which guided the presentation of the descriptive data and the parsimonious model. All role *positions* are included in the model of variates affected by MOVIESED. These include spouse to spouse, spouse to society, spouse to self, and spouse as parent to child. A summary of role positions is not attempted here, since it is more instructive to compare the affected role *prescriptions*. The prescriptions are here organized according to the strength of the MOVIESED effect on them. The first set of four prescriptions are the most firm relations attributable to MOVIESED. A final set of four indicate prescriptions which remain unaffected by any way of classification or interaction. The results are presented in an easily visualized summary, with brief discussion at each one.

### Firmer Effects of MOVIESED

Based on significance levels, total number of variates included in the model, and clarity of graphically indicated cell mean trends, the following role expectations can be identified as those most strongly affected by MOVIESED.

1. *Sex is itself a means of communication which may be openly communicated about.*

Qualification: There was an FPM interaction on SEXCOMM, so that parents, peers and media must all be taken into account in explaining agreement that sexual communication is the most important communication between spouses.

Although the sample as a whole was relatively at ease with open communication about sex, the high MOVIESED group was even more so. It even more strongly rejected the notion that people who talk too much about sex are immature; it reported greater frequency of discussion of the meaning of sex, greater discussion of sexual fantasies and sexual desires.

These effects paralleled the effect of FRENDSHIP on this prescription, since high FRENDSHIP was associated with more discussion of the meaning of the sexual relation, more insistence that sex is not difficult to talk about, and more extensive discussion of sexual fantasies with one's spouse. The M-way effects were opposite the PRNTREL effect, for it was those most distant from parents who reported greater frequency of discussion of the meaning of sex.

2. *The sexual relationship is valuable and must be worked at.*

Qualification: The FPM interaction on SEXCOMM must be taken

into account, since it involved the value judgment that sexual communication is the *most important* communication between spouses.

The sample mildly disagreed that the sexual relationship is the most significant part of a marriage, but the high MOVIESED group were either undecided or in mild agreement. The sample was undecided but the high MOVIESED group mildly agreed that improving the sexual relationship is a primary goal in marriage. High MOVIESED also agreed more that they work to make their sexual relationship enjoyable.

No F- or P-way variates were related to this prescription.

3. *Marriage is a life-long commitment of two individuals requiring legal or other social sanctions.*

Qualification: The FPM interaction on NEWFORMS, FIVEYEAR, and LIVTOGB4 must be taken into account in interpreting openness to flexibility in forms of marriage arrangements.

The sample as a whole did not affirm new forms of marriage, such as a five year contract or a trial relationship, nor did they consider divorce normative, nor that marriage is a love relationship which does not require a legal contract nor that living together before marriage is a good way to see if it will work. The high MOVIESED group was less negative about all of these options.

The only influence attributable to PRNTREL was that those closest to parents were most resistant to the idea of marriage without a legal contract. FRENDTIM dropped out of the statistical model, although there was a weak indication that high FRENDTIM was in a similar direction as high MOVIESED, with less opposition to a five year contract, more certainty that marriage is not first of all a legal contract, and less opposition to the idea of marriage without a wedding.

4. *There will be a great deal of communication with one's spouse, including focus on the quality of the relationship and sharing intimate matters.*

Qualification: Explanation of the effects on this role prescription must take into account the 3-way interaction on the extent of discussion of dissatisfactions in the marital relation.

This role prescription was highly affirmed by the whole sample and even more so by the high MOVIESED group. There was more reported discussion of dreams, more feeling that the spouses' communication was more open than that of their parents. Weaker relations which contributed to the same overall role prescription included more talk to improve the marital relation, more agreement that the spouse is the first to know of one's pain, and more openness to expressing anger as well as love in a marriage.

High PRNTREL group was less likely to discuss dislikes in their parents' marital relation and less likely to think their communication more open than their parents'. Low FRENDTIM group was less supportive of expressing anger in a marriage.

#### Unaffected Prescriptions

The following role prescriptions were not affected by MOVIESED, nor by any other classifier nor by any interactions.

1. Sexual intercourse is a sacred act and/or for the purpose of procreation.
2. Children will be properly raised and adequately supported.
3. Leisure should provide new and different experiences.
4. Economic considerations outweigh other factors in choice of a job.

Child rearing and leisure's provision of new experiences were both generally affirmed by the sample with little divergence of opinion. But the procreative function of sex, whether raising the children was the biggest task of a marriage, and the relative role of economics (vs. emotional considerations, prestige, advancement opportunity) in vocational choice were all items which illustrated a great deal of variance within the sample. This ambiguity was not clarified by the classifiers used in this investigation.

#### Tabular Summary of Role Prescriptions Affected

The especially strong relations and the role prescriptions which were unaffected have already been noted. The following tables summarize the one-way effects of the statistical models by reference to the role prescriptions which were presented at p.64-7 in Chapter 1.

The effects on marital roles of MOVIESED, PRNTREL, and FRENTTIM have now been confirmed. These findings may now be used, in conjunction with previously reported exploratory findings, to formulate conclusions and recommendations, with implications for research, theory, and practice.

Table 5.1

---

 Role Prescription Effects Associated with High MOVIESED
 

---

## Sexual: (More liberal attitudes about sex)

1. Greater communication on the meaning of sex, sexual desires and sexual fantasies.
2. More valuation of sex per se, more work to improve the sexual relation as a primary goal of marriage.
3. Even greater emphasis on sex as playful.

## Marital:

1. Less extreme opposition to non-permanent marital relations.
2. More openness to new forms of marriage.
3. Greater willingness to violate legal and social sanctions.
4. More consideration of personal needs in marriage.

## Companionate:

2. More depth communication between spouses about their relation.
  - a. More personal sharing of dreams, pains, difficult childhood experiences.
  - b. A bit more emphasis on the spouse's helping the other to grow.

## Parental:

2. More choice in birth (more valuation of natural childbirth, more liberal on abortion).
3. More reinforcing of smaller family size, in response to the population crisis.

## Leisure:

3. More use of money for leisure and more discussion on how to use it.

## Economic:

1. More agreement that husband and wife should contribute to family income, more importance on the wife's having a career, and a more liberal attitude toward the feminist movement.

Table 5.2.1

---

 Role Prescription Effects Associated with High FRENDTIM
 

---

## Sexual:

1. More discussion with spouse of the meaning of sex and sexual fantasies and more insistence that sex is not difficult to talk about.

## Marital: (These are weak relationships)

1. Less extreme opposition to non-permanent marital relation.
3. Less emphasis on marriage as legal contract and on the wedding.
4. More emphasis on personal growth and change as necessary in marriage.

## Companionate:

1. Attached less importance on spending free time with spouse.

## Parental:

4. Less agreement that raising children is the biggest task in marriage.

## Economic:

1. Less importance placed on husband's job and wife as housekeeper.
  2. Less importance placed on labor saving appliances and a comfortable house, car and clothes.
- 

Table 5.2.2

---

 Role prescription Effects Associated with Low FRENDTIM
 

---

## Companionate:

2. Less communication with spouse to improve relationship, express anger, or spouse's helping one to grow.

## Leisure:

1. Fewer social visits.
2. Less interest in artistic expression or hobbies.
3. More likely to prefer commercial entertainment.

## Economic:

1. More conservative attitude toward feminist movement.

Table 5.3.1

---

 Role Prescription Effects Associated with Close PRNTREL
 

---

## Marital:

3. More emphasis on marriage as legal contract.

## Companionate:

2. Less likely to discuss dislikes in parents' marriage and to consider themselves more open communicators than parents, but more interested in talking with spouse about anything and everything.

## Parental:

3. Want more children of their own.

## Economic:

1. Value more the wife's role as cook and housekeeper.
- 

Table 5.3.2

---

 Role Prescription Effects Associated with Distant PRNTREL
 

---

## Sexual:

1. More frequent discussion of the meaning of sex.

## Leisure:

1. Fewer social visits with other couples and less interest in dining out.
2. Less interest in do-it-yourself activity.



## Chapter 6

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Now, confirmatory and exploratory findings may be summarized and recommendations given for next steps in research. Then implications for research, theory, and practice will be discussed.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Confirmatory

From the confirmatory findings reported in Chapter 5 and summarized at p. 249f, 259ff, one can conclude that the primary hypothesis of the investigation is confirmed. Media do influence marital roles. This is true for a wide range of role positions and expectations, with the most influence on the sexual and marital role dimensions. Among those who acknowledge their influence, movies' effect upon marital role expectations is to increase open communication about sex, to increase the value attached to the sexual relationship, to reduce opposition to alternative definitions of marriage, and to facilitate intimate sharing of personal experiences. Movies liberalize attitudes about sex, abortion, and the feminist movement, and reinforce smaller family size as response to the population crisis. Also, by encouraging sex as play, marriage as fulfilling personal needs, companionship as facilitating personal growth, and natural childbirth as the preferred mode, movies contribute to the psychologized, expressive type of marriage described by Compaa (1973, p. 135). These conclusions were drawn from the trimmed model reported in Chapter 5, using MOVIESED as classifier.

But the primary hypothesis must be qualified by the secondary hypothesis, which is also confirmed. Media influence interacts with parent and peer influences. The summary of interaction effects at p.259f indicates that all six dimensions include variates which must be included in the model of 2- or 3-way interactions. Each of the four role prescriptions most strongly affected by MOVIESED must be qualified by the 3-way interaction of at least one variate related to that prescription.<sup>1</sup> Conclusions resulting from the interpretation of these interactions will be presented later, along with "Exploratory Conclusions."

Broad application of the above conclusions must be made in light of the limitations of the statistical model from which they were derived. The influence of media on marital roles was determined by reference to particular variates representing role dimensions, with effects determined by comparative study using MOVIESED as classifier. Therefore, "media" influence must be qualified by the particular medium "movies." Also, the wording of the variable MOVIESED indicates that it actually measures the self-consciousness of learnings. "Contemporary movies have been an education for our marriage." The element of self-selection has not been avoided in the present investigation. One would expect persons who go to movies to be more open to the themes of the movies. People with more liberal attitudes about sex and marriage will go to movies more and will "learn" more from the movies. Thus, the "influence" may be merely a self-selection process. This study may be seen as preparatory to experimental investigation which seeks better control against this factor of self-selection. Meanwhile, a useful description has been given of the

---

<sup>1</sup> See p. 260f.

influence movies do have, even if on a self-selected audience. At the very least, the movie audience is an important sub-culture providing meanings and definitions which govern the lives of many. The role of parent and peers in providing the basic values out of which one selects movies will be further discussed at the exploratory conclusions deriving from interactions.

The use of PRNTREL as parent classifier was perhaps the most limited among the three agents in the model. The identification of extreme groups was facilitated, but the "distant" cells  $P_1$  and  $P_3$  were particularly erratic. This may have been because verbal labels were not clearly matched to the measurement scale, or because of the small number of observations in the "distant" cells ( $P_1 = 2$ ,  $P_2 = 8$ ,  $P_3 = 10$ ). Parent/media interactions may have been complicated because PRNTREL was the most nearly related of the parent variables to MOVIESED ( $F(5,315) = 1.85$ ,  $p < .10$ ). PRNTREL was highly correlated with behavioral indicators of parental closeness or distance. One could test the P-way classification by comparison of results obtained with PRNTREL with results when the behavioral indicator PRNTPHON is used as classifier, or when PARNSIG or PRNTCLOS are used.

In order to clarify further the applicability of these findings, it would be useful to test the model by using other classifiers. MOVIATND, a behavioral report on the number of movies attended, and DISCMOVI, an indicator of agreement that "we usually discuss the movies we see in relationship to our own life and experience," both were highly correlated with MOVIESED. They should be used as classifiers to see whether the effect of movies is sustained when attendance at or degree of discussion of movies is used. This would further counteract the

limitation of self-selection. Other media classifiers which might be used include NTTV, NTREAD, and MAGAZINE. These would help to clarify the relation of the findings to the "book reading" and "television viewing" populations.

The following findings are not systematically reported because they are merely examples of the kind of study which could be done systematically to clarify further the limitations of the model using MOVIESED as the indicator of "media influence." When MAGAZINE was used as classifier, the effect on the sexual role variates was remarkably similar to the effect of MOVIESED. For the 11 variates which were univariately significant in the MOVIESED model at  $p < .05$ , all but two (VARIETY,  $p < .058$ ; SEXMOST,  $p < .207$ ) remained univariately significant when MAGAZINE was used as classifier. For the five variates FSEXTALK, MAKENJOY, MPROVSEX, SEXCOMM, and XPERIMNT, the multivariate  $F(25,1157) = 2.85$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R = .384$ . For the six variates ATTSEX, DSSXFANT, SEXMOST, IMMATURE, VARIETY, and DSSEXDES, multivariate  $F(30,1242) = 2.57$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R = .349$ . In addition, MPSXPLAY and MAXSXTIM were univariately significant when MAGAZINE was used as classifier for sex role variates. Thus, the education provided by movies, at least for sexual roles, is closely related to the number of magazine articles on sex and marriage which one has read.

When NTTV, interest in watching television, was used as an indicator of media influence, none of the effects attributable to MOVIESED on the sexual, marital, and companionate role variates remained. For the eight leisure role variates univariately significant in the M-way model, only MAKEFUN, DSLEISMN, SOCBUDGT, and NTNITCLB remained significant at  $p < .05$ . NTDINOUT and NTERTAIN were added to the model when NTTV was

used as classifier. It is not likely that interest in watching television will be a good indicator of the education provided by movies.

Interest in reading (NTREAD) was only slightly better in approximating the MOVIESED model. None of the 11 sexual roles univariately significant in the M-way classification at  $p < .05$  remained so when NTREAD was the classifier, though XPERIMNT ( $p < .064$ ), VARIETY ( $p < .136$ ), and DSSXFANT ( $p < .161$ ) approached it. Of eight marital role variates univariately significant at  $p < .01$  when MOVIESED was classifier, only two, PRSNGROW ( $p < .005$ ) and FIVEYEAR ( $p < .003$ ), remained in the model when NTREAD was classifier, the rest being significant at  $p > .05$ . The effect of NTREAD on companionate roles was similar to that of MOVIESED. Of six variates univariately significant in the M-way model at  $p < .05$ , four (DSDREAMS, OPENCOMM, NTTLKIMP, XPRSANGR) retained the same effect for NTREAD (at  $p < .01$ ), and two were marginal (FRSTTONO,  $p < .065$ ; DSDISSAT,  $p < .119$ ). DSDISLIK, DSDIFEXP, NTTALK--three variates which had been marginal in the M-way of classification ( $p > .05$ ) were significantly affected by the NTREAD classification at  $p < .01$ .

In short, other ways of classification available for this present investigation would have turned up different results from the effects attributable to MOVIESED. Preliminary checks indicated that NTTV and NTREAD were quite different from MOVIESED in their effects, though there was at least some similarity of NTTV and MOVIESED on the leisure dimension and of NTREAD and MOVIESED on the companionate dimension. MAGAZINE'S effect on at least the sex role variates was remarkably similar to the effect of MOVIESED. The chief reason for reporting these results, scattered though they may be, is to indicate the kind of investigation which is required for further understanding of the

limitations of the model presented in Chapter 5. Any conclusions from this investigation, then, must be only cautiously applied beyond the explicit effects of movies. Testing of the movie effect by further reference to movie attendance and discussion of movies must be done.

The adequacy of FRENDTIM as classifier for the F-way model could be tested against results using LIFESTYL, SOCVISIT, NTFRENDS or NTGROGRP. The latter two may further clarify the differing peer populations hypothesized in Chapter 4. SOCVISIT may tap elements of the marriage roles which are especially salient to the peer relations of the *couple*, as opposed to the friendships of the *individual*.

In addition to acknowledged limitations imposed by the choice of classifier, there may be effects attributable to other sources of variation. These must be removed in order to indicate that the effect here reported is indeed attributable to movies and not some intervening variable, such as sex, education, socio-economic status, or religion. One-way analysis of variance was performed using MOVIESED as classifier and demographic variables as variates. Some likely alternative sources to explain variance in marriage roles were AGE ( $F(5,315) = 3.86, p < .002$ ), ATTREL ( $F(5,315) = 3.64, p < .003$ ), STUDMILI ( $F(5,315) = 2.65, p < .023$ ), and PRRELATI ( $F(5,315) = 2.42, p < .036$ ). Those for whom movies were an education for marriage were more likely to be young, liberal in attitudes about religion, students, and influenced in marriage preparation by "relatives." Again, some preliminary results will provide examples of the type of further research needed, but cannot be taken as conclusive. In analysis of covariance, some of these effects were removed to test the strength of the relation of MOVIESED and the marriage role variates.

For instance, in the marital dimension, the effect of MOVIESED

on four of the top ten variates in the M-way model was tested by removing other possible sources of variation. The four tested were PRSNGROW, LOVVSLEG, DIVORCE, and TRIALREL. The covariates which were used were related to relatives (VISRELAT, PRRELATI), socio-economic status (STUDMILI, URBNRURL, EDUCATN, INCOME, INCOMEWP), religious variables (RELIGIMP, DSRELBEL, RELIGSTY, NTCRCSER, NTCRCMET, ATTREL, PRPASTOR, COHELP), plus AGE and SEX. Within cells regression at  $p < .05$  was discovered for several of the covariates. PRSNGROW was related to AGE, SEX, URBNRURL, RELIGIMP, PRPASTOR, and COHELP. LOVVSLEG was related to the two "relatives" variables, as well as SEX, STUDMILI, INCOME, and all of the "religion" variables. DIVORCE was related to VISRELAT, EDUCATN, and all "religion" variables except PRPASTOR. TRIALREL was related to all of the "religion" variates. A good indicator of the way in which the removal of the covariates enhanced or detracted from the explanatory power of the MOVIESED effect is the relation of the multiple R attached to the multivariate F for each analysis of covariance to the multiple R for the M-way effect, before any covariance is removed. The removal of AGE and SEX together did not affect the overall significance of the multivariate F ( $p < .001$ ), and it only slightly reduced the multiple R (from .376 to .358). By itself STUDMILI reduced the multiple R to .356. No covariate caused the multiple R to fluctuate more than  $\pm .02$ . The marital dimension variates were most affected by religion variables. When RELIGIMP, RELIGSTY, NTCRCSER, and ATTREL were removed together as a covariate set, the effect on the multiple R for the marital variate set was to reduce it from .376 to .336 (within cells regression Multivariate  $F(16,942) = 7.19$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R = .515$ ). On the other hand, removal of the set DSRELBEL, RELABEL, RELPREF, and PRPASTOR actually

enhanced the multiple R (to .405) (within cells regression Multivariate  $F(16,942) = 4.17, p < .001, R = .398$ ). In short, for the marital role dimension the removal of possible other sources of variation did not remove the MOVIESED effect, though age, sex, student/military status, and certain attitudes about religion did slightly reduce the total explained variance.

For the companionate role dimension the variates OPENCOMM, XPRSANGR, FRSTTONO, and DSDREAMS were tested for the possible effects of certain demographic variables. There was virtually no change in the MOVIESED effect with the removal of STUDEMILI, EDUCATN, PRCOURSE, VISRELAT, PRRELATI, or URBNRURL. The combination of SEX, AGE and PRLIVING as a covariate set produced a within cells regression Multivariate  $F(12,818) = 4.80, p < .001, R = .399$ . The removal of these covariates all univariately significant at  $p < .001$  or  $p < .002$  for the within cells regression, only reduced the multiple R from .300 to .277, Multivariate  $F(20,1026) = 2.58$ . Of the S.E.S. indicators only a few covariates (INCOME, LIVSTAND, EXPINCOM) created within cells regressions (for XPRSANGR, OPENCOMM, DSDREAMS, respectively) at low significance levels ( $p < .01, p < .043, p < .04$ ). Each of these four companionate variates exhibited significant ( $p < .05$ ) within cells regression for at least one of seven religion covariates. The strongest of these relations ( $p < .01$ ) linked FRSTTONO with NTCRCMET and NTCRCSE, OPENCOMM with DSRELBEL and RELABEL, and DSDREAMS with DSRELBEL. Their joint effect was not determined, but separately they did not appreciably change the M-way effect.

For the parental role dimension the removal, individually, of the socio-economic indicators STANDARD, INCOME, INCOMEWP, and RENT left the multiple R virtually unchanged when the MOVIESED model was tested



for other sources of variation, though all of them exhibited significant within cells regression for at least ADOPTKID and POPUCRIS. The covariate set AGE, SEX, LNGTHMAR, and NUMCHILD exhibited within cells regression, Multivariate  $F(20,1019) = 2.59$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R = .312$ , but left the M-way effect virtually unchanged. STUDEMILI and EDUCATN had effects particularly on ADOPTKID and ATTFEM, and reduced the univariate significance of ADOPTKID in the M-way model, but without change in the multiple R. Likewise, the removal of RELATIVS and VISRELATI did not affect the M-way model, despite their relation to ATTABORT. Religion co-variates especially affected ATTABORT and ATTFEM. When the effect of ATTREL was removed, with its within cells regression Multivariate  $F(5,310) = 15.12$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R = .443$ , POPUCRIS, ADOPTKID, and ATTABORT were all reduced in univariate significance in the M-way model to  $p < .05$ , and the multiple R was reduced from .344 ( $p < .001$ ) to .298 ( $p < .007$ ).

For the leisure variates (except NTPAINT and DSLEISMN), the M-way effect was actually enhanced when the economic status indicators CARVALUE and STANDARD were removed. The multiple R jumped from .255 to .276 (for the former) and to .323 (for the latter).

For the sexual role variates, the removal of the effect of SEX left the effects of MOVIESED unchanged. The only variates indicating significant effect of sex were MAKENJOY, ATTSEX, and FSEXTALK (within cells regression significant at  $p < .001$ ,  $p < .056$ , and  $p < .134$ , respectively). An 11-variate model including (in order of decreasing standardized discriminant function coefficients) ATTSEX, DSSXFANT, FSEXTALK, SEXMOST, MAKENJOY, VARIETY, MPROVSEX, DSSXDES, XPERIMNT, and SEXCOMM was used to remove the effect of SEX. The multivariate F, still significant at  $p < .001$ ,  $R = .487$ , remained virtually unchanged when the

sex effect was removed.<sup>2</sup>

This spotty evidence, while it is not to be taken as conclusive support for all the MOVIESED effects reported in Chapter 5, does indicate that the effect remains even when major demographic indicators like education, socio-economic status, religion, age, and sex are removed. Even if further exploration of alternative explanations of variance discredits some of the reported effects, there are enough stable effects reported just in the brief preliminary data above to maintain the hypothesis that media do influence marital roles. It remains for further investigation to indicate the strongest relationships and the exact nature of the impact of age, sex, number of years married, number of children, and socio-economic, residential, and religious factors.

A further alternative explanation of the results obtained when the procedure might be compared to "data-dredging" for significant relations, might be that many of the variables would be significant due to chance alone. That is why graphic indication of cell means was used to test statistical significance against substantive meaning. Also, results were continuously referred to one another in search of ambiguities and contradictions, as well as mutually reinforcing trends. Though some of the variates in the parsimonious model reported in Appendix F may be attributable to chance, certainly those reported as the firmest effects remain, and the broadly-stated hypothesis remains confirmed.

In short, in the preliminary search for alternative explanations of variance, no major discoveries suggest change of the basic model

---

<sup>2</sup> Without allowing for covariance,  $F(30,1242) = 4.21$ ; removing SEX effect,  $F(30,1238) = 4.17$ .

presented in Chapter 5. It must be kept in mind that "media influence" is actually the acknowledged, self-conscious learning from contemporary movies. It remains to be seen whether classification by movie attendance or discussion of movies will confirm the model, or whether MAGAZINE reading about sex and marriage parallels the movie influence. It appears that interest in watching television and interest in reading do not indicate the same dimensions as the response to MOVIESED. Further, other variables affect the marriage role variates, most notably age, sex, religious attitudes, and to a lesser extent length of marriage, number of children, socio-economic status, and obligation to relatives. But no explanatory variable thus far examined seriously reduces the effect of MOVIESED which was reported in Chapter 5. Even if some effects should be discounted through further exploration, the basic hypothesis stands confirmed. Movies do influence some marital roles. Thus far, no evidence has been obtained to cause revision of the model presented in Chapter 5.

On the basis of the conclusions drawn here, the following further research is recommended, first using the present data, and second, going beyond the present data. Using the data from the Marital Style Inventory, the means of classification needs to be tested. For the *media* way of classification the effects of MOVIATND and DISCMOVI could be compared to MOVIESED. Also, MAGAZINE and BOOKS may be used as classifiers to see the extent to which these media may have similar effects as movies. For the *parent* way of classification, the PRNTREL model might be compared to effects of PARNTSIG, PRNTCLOS and PRNTFACE; and for the *peer* way of classification the effects of FRENDTIM could be tested against the effects of LIFESTYL, SOCVISIT, NTGROGRP and NTFRENDS.

Other sources of variation, representing other sources of socialization, could be related to the model as qualifiers of the media, just as parents and peers have been related to the model through PRNTREL and FRENDTIM. One important dimension that could be tested would be the influence of the spouses on one another in the marital dyad. Data could be arranged so as to achieve an index of congruence between a husband's and his wife's responses. Such an index could be related to the number of years married, with the assumption that they would move toward greater congruence with more years of marriage, because they have served as socialization agents for one another. The effect of the church as socialization agent could be related to media since many of the indicators of religiosity have an important influence on some of the role dimensions reported.

Further delineation of the media effect on roles would include relating the roles to one another. Throughout this investigation the six role dimensions have been treated separately. They are obviously also related to one another. A more parsimonious model could be achieved which would allow for intercorrelations across role dimensions. This would lend statistical verification to the judgments regarding relative importance of role prescriptions affected.<sup>3</sup> Also, the shift in one aspect, such as the shift which movie education is causing in the sexual and marital role dimensions particularly, may cause shifts in other role dimensions. This could be determined by using as classifiers some of the most significantly affected variables (e.g., DSSXFANT or NEWFORMS) to determine the effect of changes in these role expectations on the other roles of marriage. For instance, what is the impact

---

<sup>3</sup> See p. 259ff.

of the pressure for new forms of marriage on parental roles? on companionship? on sexual roles? on economic roles? Or what effect does the shift in sexual expression and the meaning of marriage have on the liberation of women? on vocational commitment? on mobility?

Beyond the data explored here in secondary analysis, the following research is recommended. The present investigation was based on data gathered for an entirely different purpose than that of confirming the hypothesis that media influence marital roles. Although this research has broken new ground in the relation to marital socialization of media communication, further investigations need to focus more explicitly on that relationship. Surveys could probe more adequately a wide range of questions about media and marital roles. Longitudinal studies taken at times prior to, at the time of, and following marriage could explore adult socialization in process. Accounts of preparation for marriage gathered through survey research could be supplemented by case studies describing the characteristic interaction patterns which are difficult to obtain through individually answered survey studies. Such research will further delineate specific types of media used in a strategy of learning for marriage, the settings in which they are used, the interpersonal interactions that accompany them, and the range of marriage role options before and after the learning has occurred.

### Exploratory

This summary of exploratory conclusions not only takes into account the data of Chapter 4, summarized at p. 219f, but also the tentative conclusions stated as hypotheses arising out of the contradictions, not-quite-significant relations and interactions reported in the confirmatory model of Chapter 5. Further exploration is projected

on the basis of all these findings.

The great contribution which MOVIESED made to the confirmatory model, in contrast to the lesser role of FRENDTIM and PRNTREL, must not obscure the importance of these interpersonal influences. On the question of sources for learning about and preparation for marriage, which organized so much of the inquiry in search of comparative groups, the influence of parents, dating, and friendships was much greater than any medium. Of media influences, books were more often selected as influential than television or magazines.

The media variable chosen for the confirmatory analysis, MOVIESED, was related to parent, peer, and media dimensions in complex ways. Agreement on MOVIESED was associated with greater likelihood that television and/or magazines had been considered influential. High reading of books was associated with both extremes of MOVIESED, strong agreement and strong disagreement. Agreement on MOVIESED seemed to be related to more distance from peers.

The extreme "pure" media influence groups (i.e., those who included magazines or television among very few other influences in preparation for marriage) seemed to have elevated the importance of the media influence at the expense of the peer dimension. Especially in light of the significant interactions detected in the confirmatory analysis, further exploration of the complex relationships among the various influences is indicated. The samples of book readers and television viewers should be described more carefully. Also, the relation of these media populations to parent and peer populations has barely been tapped.

Hypotheses. The following hypotheses were generated in the exploratory phases of the investigation or in the "fall-out" from the confirmatory reporting.

First, a person's degree of openness to experience must be taken into account in the socialization process. It affects a person's communicative behavior, relating the individual to the wider social world, whether through symbolic interaction with face to face reference groups or with media references. The reported high degree of correlation among the communication modes suggests this hypothesis.

Second, high media use is associated with both extremes--close and distant--of interpersonal functioning. Crosstabulation of the media preparation items by indicators of interpersonal closeness demonstrated that those most influenced by media were consistently more likely to be at the extremes of interpersonal closeness or distance.

Third, movies often reinforce peer culture, in opposition to parental influence. In the confirmatory model, especially on the sexual and marital roles, this trend was observed in the graphic comparison of cell mean trends for FSEXTALK, DSSXFANT, and HARDTALK. Further, peer influence was in the direction of media influence for PRSNGROW, CONTRACT, FIVEYEAR, NOWEDDNG, and ATTIFEM, and parent influence was opposite the direction of media influence for LOVVSLEG, MAXSXTIM, OPENCOMM, DSDISLIK, MPCOOK AND WIFEEARN.

Fourth, two different media populations may be described, the one oriented to books and the other oriented to magazine reading and television viewing. Examination of the interrelations of media variables led to this hypothesis, but careful description of these subsamples remains to be done.

Fifth, dating is a special form of peer influence which has parental sanction. This hypothesis is stated after comparing the relations of those for whom dating was (or was not) influential and those for whom friendships were (or were not). Further, the difference between growth group-oriented peer interaction and friendships remains to be explored.

Contradictions. Some contradictions invite further exploration. For instance, the cell  $M_1$ , those who most strongly agreed that movies were an education for their marriage, often deviated from a trend otherwise well established. Could it be that this was due to merely a response set which checked extreme answers, thus causing wild fluctuations in a cell mean which already had a high degree of error due to its small size? The anomaly of this cell remains to be explored. Further, the variance on the DS variables (indicating the degree of discussion of various items) was unusually high. Why?

Interactions. Interaction effects for the nine most significant 3-way interactions (reported in Appendix G) were graphically presented and examined according to a 12-cell division. These cells are summarized at Table 6.1. Observations were placed into one of two categories of the main effect of media--high MOVIESED ( $M_2, M_3$ ) and low MOVIESED ( $M_5, M_6$ ). Within each media category, observations were further divided into three cells from high to low PRNTREL ( $P_7, P_5, P_3$ ). Finally, within each of the resulting six categories, a final classification was made according to high FRENDTIM ( $F_1, F_3$ ) and low FRENDTIM ( $F_4, F_6$ ). For each of the nine variates in the 3-way interaction model, cell means were determined for each of the 12 cells used to categorize responses.



Table 6.1

| Classification of 3-Way interacting Variates |                              |                     |               |                    |          |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------|
| <u>MOVIESED</u>                              | <u>PRNTREL</u>               | <u>FRENDTIM</u>     | <u>Code</u>   | <u>Description</u> | <u>n</u> |
| High ( $M_2, M_3$ )                          | Unusually Close<br>( $P_7$ ) | High ( $F_1, F_3$ ) | $M_H P_3 F_H$ | Media & Friend     | 3        |
|                                              |                              | Low ( $F_4, F_6$ )  | $M_H P_3 F_L$ | "Media Only"       | 1        |
|                                              | Fair<br>( $P_5$ )            | High                | $M_H P_5 F_L$ |                    | 13       |
|                                              |                              | Low                 | $M_H P_5 F_L$ |                    | 8        |
|                                              | Cool<br>( $P_3$ )            | High                | $M_H P_3 F_H$ | High Communicator  | 4        |
|                                              |                              | Low                 | $M_H P_3 F_L$ | Media & Parent     | 3        |
| Low ( $M_5, M_6$ )                           | Unusually Close<br>( $P_7$ ) | High                | $M_L P_3 F_H$ | "Friend Only"      | 1        |
|                                              |                              | Low                 | $M_L P_3 F_L$ | Non-Communicative  | 2        |
|                                              | Fair<br>( $P_5$ )            | High                | $M_L P_5 F_H$ |                    | 8        |
|                                              |                              | Low                 | $M_L P_5 F_L$ |                    | 2        |
|                                              | Cool<br>( $P_3$ )            | High                | $M_L P_7 F_H$ | Parent & Friend    | 7        |
|                                              |                              | Low                 | $M_L P_7 F_L$ | "Parent Only"      | 1        |

These cell means were visually compared in a search for explanatory trends. Since the simple M-, P-, and F-way effects cannot be taken as the best explanation for these variates, the M-way effect must be qualified by the various levels of P and F. Because the number of observations for each cell was small, the results cannot be taken as conclusive. But the exploration revealed some striking results, especially when the nine variates are taken together.

For the *sex role variates* SEXISFUN, XPERIMNT, and SEXCOMM, the direction of media influence (*if* it could be considered alone) was toward a lower mean, for a greater valuation of sexual play, experimentation, and communication. From graphic presentation of the 12 cell means for each of the three sex role variates in the interaction model, we can predict that the score which best epitomizes the *positive* direction of media influence will be found in cell  $M_H P_7 F_L$ . That is, the most extreme

media influence will be found when in addition to scoring high on MOVIESED, one is also unusually close to one's parents and does not spend much time with a friend. The score which best epitomizes the *negative* direction of media influence is found at cell  $M_L P_7 F_L$ . That is, the most extreme resistance to media influence is found when one, in addition to scoring low on MOVIESED, also is unusually close to one's parents and does not spend much time with a friend. This is the exact reciprocal of the above cell! In other words, when high parental influence is coupled with low peer influence, then the media influence, if present, is most strongly affirmed, or if absent, is most strongly negated. We might say that cell  $M_L P_7 F_L$  represents the influence of "parents only," since parent influence was high while movie and friend influence were low. Of all the 12 cells, this "parent only" cell was the *least* affirming of each of the three sex role variates. This may be compared with the "media only" cell represented by  $M_H P_3 F_L$ . The "media only" cell was just as unaffirming of SEXISFUN as the "parent only" cell, second only to the "parent only" cell in lukewarmness on XPERIMNT, and among the least affirming of SEXCOMM of any of the six high MOVIESED cells. In other words, the influence of media alone was the *least* effective in securing an attitude in the direction of media influence. More effect was obtained when either parent or peer influence was also involved, but especially when only *parent* influence was high. The effect of "friends only" (cell  $M_L P_3 F_H$ ), was opposite that of "movies only" or "parents only" on two variables. Whereas the parent and movie cells had been *least* affirming of SEXISFUN, the "friends only" cell was the most affirming. SEXCOMM, least affirmed by "parent only" and least affirmed (among  $M_H$ ) by "media only," was *most* affirmed (among the low

MOVIESED cells) by the "friends only" cell. In other words, "friends only" influence was more in the direction one would expect from media, opposite "parent only" and "media only," which were least in the direction of media influence. When both media and friend influence was high, as in cell  $M_H P_3 F_H$ , then there was as much affirmation of SEXISFUN as for the "high parent-high media cell" ( $M_H P_7 F_L$ ). "High friend-high media" was among the most affirming (among  $M_H$  cells) of SEXCOMM, but, opposite  $M_H P_7 F_L$ , it was next to least affirming (among the  $M_H$  cells) of XPERIMNT. It is striking to note that in the cells representing  $P_7$ , "unusually close" to parents, more FRENDTIM was a more conservative influence if there was also high MOVIESED, but more FRENDTIM was a more liberalizing influence if there was low MOVIESED. In other words, peers functioned in the opposite direction of the expected media influence when one was "unusually close" to parents, while parents reinforced the expected direction of media influence or non-influence.

Another way to examine media effect interacting with parents and peers is to pair cells so that their sole difference is whether they were high or low MOVIESED (as in cells  $M_H P_7 F_L$  and  $M_L P_7 F_L$  above). Such a comparison calls attention to the deviations from the expected direction of media influence. When *both* friends and parents here highly influential, then the effect of media was either nullified (as in XPERIMNT and SEXCOMM) or reversed (as in SEXISFUN). When one was "distant" from parents ( $P_3$ ), then the media effect was observed only for SEXCOMM, being reversed or nullified for SEXISFUN and for XPERIMNT. In other words, when both parents and peers were highly influential, then high MOVIESED was likely to elicit more conservative response than low MOVIESED. Also,

opposite the effect of being "unusually close" to parents ( $P_7$ ), which tended to reinforce the media direction, being "distant" from parents ( $P_3$ ) was more likely to reverse or down play the MOVIESED influence. Among those "distant" from parents, those spending less FRENDTIM were more conservative if they were high on MOVIESED, but they were more liberal if they were low on MOVIESED.

The relations indicated by graphic presentation of the 3-way interactions of three sex role variates are summarized here:

1. If high PRNTREL and low FRENDTIM, then PRNTREL reinforced the direction of media influence.
2. High "friend only" was more likely to be a liberal response than "parent only" or "media only."
3. Peers functioned in the opposite direction of the media influence, if one was unusually close to parents, but in a more liberalizing fashion if one was distant from parents.
4. If both parents and peers were high, then movie influence was more conservative and less movie influence was more liberal.
5. For those more distant from parents, then the more liberal were low MOVIESED, and the more conservative were high MOVIESED.

Graphic presentation of the three chief *marital role variates* in the 3-way interaction and also of the two variates in the FM model, further clarified the character of the media-, parent-, peer interactions. The score that best epitomized the positive direction of media influence (more liberal on LIVTOGB4, NEWFORMS, and FIVEYEAR) was found in cell  $M_H P_3 F_L$ . Unlike the sexual role dimension, the most positive media influence was found here in the "media only" cell, with both FRENDTIM and PRNTREL low. Like the sexual dimension, the score epitomizing the negative direction of media influence was found in cell  $M_L P_7 F_L$ , the "parent only" cell, or in cell  $M_L P_3 F_H$ , the "friends only" cell. On LIVTOGB4 and FIVEYEAR, equally likely to be most disapproving of these

new definitions of social sanction regarding marriage, was the group that was low on all three agent-dimensions,  $M_L P_3 F_L$ .

Examination of the paired cells which were alike in every regard except the high or low MOVIESED influence revealed that in every instance where there was low FRENDTIM, the direction of influence expected for MOVIESED was present. Also, in every instance where parent, friends, and media were all three high ( $M_H P_7 F_H$ ), the influence was nullified or even in the opposite direction as would be expected from media influence. In other words, low peer influence allows the media influence, regardless of the level of parent involvement. And "high parent-high peer" relations function in the absence of media in a more liberal fashion, and in the presence of media influence in a more conservative fashion. On LIVTOGB4 and FIVEYEAR, the high friendship group was also nullified or opposite expectation when the parental closeness was low ( $P_3 F_H$ ).

The "media only" influence on the three variates in the marital interaction is the more striking when one examines it in comparison to various combinations of media. Media and Parents ( $M_H P_7 F_L$ ) and Media and Friends ( $M_H P_3 F_H$ ), when one examines the six  $M_H$  cells, are among those least in agreement with these re-definitions of the marriage contract, with one exception (of the  $M_H$  cells,  $M_H P_3 F_H$  was next to most affirming on NEWFORMS). If one were to predict which of the  $M_H$  cells would be most influenced by MOVIESED, the best prediction for the three marital roles discussed here would be "media only." Media and Parent ( $M_H P_7 F_L$ ) and Media and Friend ( $M_H P_3 F_H$ ), and high Media and Parent and Friend ( $M_H P_7 F_H$ ) were among the least affirming of the high MOVIESED cells (with the above-noted exception of NEWFORMS). The different way in which friends functioned in the presence or absence of media was clearly

pictured in the graphs. For each variate, one may compare the relation of the  $F_L$  and  $F_H$  means to each other in any of the "P" cells (e.g.,  $P_3$ ,  $P_5$ , or  $P_7$ ) with that same relation on the corresponding "P" cell when the media effect is reversed. Nine such comparisons may be made for the three interacting marital variates. In six of the nine comparisons, the influence of FRENDTIM was reversed by the influence of MOVIESED. In the case of low MOVIESED, high FRENDTIM serves a liberalizing function, but in the case of high MOVIESED, high FRENDTIM serves a more conservatizing function. The only exceptions to this instance were the  $P_5$  cells for FIVEYEAR and NEWFORMS, (and there was not as much variation between  $F_L$  and  $F_H$  groups in the  $P_5$  cells anyway) and the  $P_7$  cells of LIVTOGB4.

The association of high FRENDTIM with a liberal trend if low MOVIESED and with a conservative trend if high MOVIESED was corroborated by the FM interaction for MEETNEED.<sup>4</sup> These observations may mean that those who are isolated from friends are most conservative if they have rejected media input, but if they seek media as a source of social input, they are more susceptible to the media influence, since they have no stabilizing peer relations.

Results of the graphic presentation of the chief marital variates in the interaction model may now be summarized:

1. "Media only" served in the most liberal direction, with "parents only" the most conservative and "friends only" also highly conservative. Media were not as liberalizing, however, in concert with parents and/or peers.
2. Both the "super-communicator" (high on every agent dimension) and the "non-communicator" (low on every agent dimension) tended to be highly disapproving of shifts in marital mores.

---

<sup>4</sup> Based on comparison of graphically indicated cell means for  $M_L F_H$  and for  $M_H F_H$ .

3. High friendships, whether parents were close or distant, actually served as a conservative buffer against the liberalizing effect of media. When FRENDTIM was high, then the low MOVIESED group was more liberal and the high MOVIESED group was more conservative.
4. Low friendships, in every instance, reinforced the direction of media influence, more liberal if high MOVIESED and more conservative if low MOVIESED. Thus, the socially isolated were more susceptible to the high or low influence of media. The image that emerges is that social isolation leads to extremism, whether in the backwaters with those hostile to the changing trends which find expression in the media, or in the "cutting edge" where people are creating the new trends.

The only *companionate role variate* that was graphically indicated as a 3-way interaction was DSDISSAT. In contrast to its corresponding low MOVIESED cell, every high MOVIESED cell indicated more discussion of dissatisfactions in the marital relationship, just as expected from the M-way effect on DSDISSAT. As with the sex variates, the media direction was epitomized at  $M_H P_7 F_L$ , with the high parent influence reinforcing the high MOVIESED influence with FRENDTIM low. As in two of the marital variates related to new forms of marriage, the opposite of this media influence was best represented by cell  $M_L P_3 F_L$ , with the least discussion of dissatisfactions in the marital relationship among those who least interacted with parents, peers, or media, the "low communicator" cell. The "high communicator" cell, however ( $M_H P_7 F_H$ ) exhibited the least discussion of dissatisfactions in marriage among the six high MOVIESED cells.

Among the six high cells, media influence was most moderated when it was the sole influence ( $M_H P_3 F_L$ ), or when all three agents were high ( $M_H P_7 F_H$ ). Among the cells indicating low MOVIESED influence, the "parents only" cell ( $M_L P_7 F_L$ ) exhibited next to the least amount of discussion of dissatisfactions, but the "friends only" cell ( $M_L P_3 F_H$ ) operated more in a MOVIESED direction, exhibiting the most discussion

of DSDISSAT among the low MOVIESED cells.

The 3-way interaction for the *economic role variate* MANYCAR was graphically presented, revealing the following relationships of interest. When cells were paired with the only difference being high and low MOVIESED, then the direction expected for media alone (more agreement with MANYCAR) was found for all but one comparison ( $P_{5F_H}$  remained the same). There was less variation, especially on the high MOVIESED cells, than for the 3-way interactions thus far reported, so that extremes cannot be indicated as profitably. As noted on several previous interactions, the effect of "media only" ( $M_H P_3 F_L$ ) was the least pronounced of the effects in the high MOVIESED groups. No clearly indicated patterns can be reported from this interaction, since in many respects it stood alone and did not follow trends indicated for other graphed interactions. This may indicate that the economic roles act differently than the other roles and need to be studied on their own, but such is not feasible in the present investigation and with such scant evidence from one graphically presented relationship.

In the *leisure role variate* set only one interaction was detected, NTNITCLB. One would predict on the basis of MOVIESED response alone, that there would be more interest in night club entertainment on the part of the high MOVIESED group. As in SEXISFUN, LIVTOGB4, and FIVEYEAR, the cell most in the direction of media influence was the "friend only" cells ( $M_L P_3 F_H$ ), with "parent only" ( $M_L P_7 F_L$ ) the least in the direction of media influence (as had been the case for all the sexual and the marital role variates). As for some of the previously reported interactions, parental influence alone reinforced the presence or absence of media influence, while friendships served as a conservative influence among high MOVIESED and as a liberal influence among low MOVIESED, when high parent is held



constant.

The following hypotheses summarize the findings resulting from exploration of the nine 3-way interaction effects. These are the conditions which facilitate or resist media influence.

1. "Media only" is among the least effective influences toward a media indicated direction.

The only exceptions to this were the three marital variates, where "media only" most epitomized the direction of media influence. In the six other variates it was among the least effective influences in securing the anticipated media direction, and for the three sexual variates and DSDISSAT, it was actually *least* indicative (among 12 cells) of a media-influenced response.

2. "Media and parent" is most effective in achieving a change in a media-oriented direction.

Although this combination moderates the media influence on the marital variables, for the other six variates, when both media and parent are high, the media direction is reinforced, and in fact epitomized in the case of the three sex variates and DSDISSAT. The direction of effect expected from high or low media alone was reinforced in every case for the  $P_7F_L$  pair of cells and in all but one case for  $P_5F_L$ .

3. "Parent only" is among the most effective predictors of resistance to media influence.

This is the reverse side of the coin of the above statement regarding  $P_7F_L$  and  $P_5F_L$  cells. On all the variates but MANYCAR, the "parent only" cell was least like the media influence. Media influence is neutralized or reversed in the cells involving low parent relation ( $P_3$ ) for XPERIMNT, SEXISFUN, and NTNITCLB. Coupled with the above "media and parent" effect, this "parent only" effect means that the greatest extremes in either direction are the extremes reinforced by an "unusually" close

parental relationship with less time spent with a friend. This supports the notion that basic value commitments (reflected especially in the sexual variates) of the parents (with high affectivity and strong power differential) are reinforced regardless of whether the stand taken is a pro- or anti-media stance. On the marital variates, however, the media direction is most strongly indicated by the "media only" cell, which might be taken to mean that the mores regarding marriage (vs. the basic values regarding sex) are more susceptible to movie influence, as Blumer had indicated.

4. "Friend only" often reinforces the direction of media influence. This is true on all variates but XPERIMNT and MANYCAR. In fact, for LIVTOGB4, FIVEYEAR, SEXISFUN, and NTNITCLB, the "friends only" cell epitomizes the direction of media influence. Comparison of the "media only", "parent only" and "friend only" cells indicates that media function most similarly to peer groups in influence, in a direction opposite those who are unusually close to parents, similar to a finding reported from the examination of cell mean trends in the confirmatory model.

5. When "parent" influence is unusually high, then high "peer" influence serves as a moderator of the parent-expected influence in either a pro- or anti-media direction.

When the parent factor is held constant at "unusually close" then high friend time affects variables differently for high and low media, just the opposite of the expected effects from movies. This same effect was obtained in graphic presentation of the FM interactions for MEETNEED and NATUBRTH. In the low media group, friends function in a conservative fashion. This reversal of the direction of influence of high friend time for high and low media was observed for all of the 3-way variates except LIVTOGB4.

6. Highest and lowest communicators are often strikingly similar. A non-media direction, more conservative, was exhibited for both highest and lowest communicators on the variables SEXCOMM, SEXISFUN, DSDISSAT, and the three marital variates. Further, for all the sexual and marital variates and NTNITCLB, the direction one would predict from media influence is not found if both parents and peers are highly influential ( $P_{7F_H}$ ). The media-anticipated direction of influence is neutralized or reversed if both parents and peers are high. This moderation of media effect is opposite the extremes of the "parent only" effect. Persons who are highly affected by parents and who have less strong peer relations may be socially isolated, either out of touch with and hostile toward current social trends, or pressing at the forefront for social change. Social isolation may lead to extremism, whether in the backwaters or on the "cutting edge" of new trends.

In addition to the above six hypotheses indicating the interpersonal dynamics under which media do and do not have influence, two observations are prompted by the examination of interactions. First, it is surprising that there was so little interaction among the parental variates. Hill and Aldous (1969) had expected that the parental roles would be those most effectively determined by parental models. Thus, one would expect more interaction at least with parents, on the parental variates. One possible explanation is that the parental influence on parental roles is so universal that there is little variation from high and low parent influence on that dimension. Further, the movies do not stress parental roles as much as they do romantic involvements of sexual behavior, providing models of romance which have implications for the meaning of marriage.

A second observation is that openness to new forms of marriage is not necessarily related to a greater stress on sexual behavior. The "media only" interaction cell was least affirming of XPERIMNT, SEXCOMM, and SEXISFUN, but most affirming of LIVTOGB4, NEWFORMS, and FIVEYEAR.

Further exploration needed. All of the exploratory findings may now be summarized and related to one another in a discussion of what further exploration is indicated. Some of the recommended investigation may take the form of further secondary analysis of the data explored here. Some may further sharpen the issues in another survey instrument to be used on a new sample. Still other exploration may take the form of case studies to provide specific descriptions of ways in which media and other agents relate to one another in socialization for marital roles. Not many specific investigations are recommended here, but the suggested parameters should usefully inform further exploration of media's role in marital socialization. Discussion is organized first around the exploration of comparative populations, then around the way in which parent and peer agents moderate or intensify media effects, and finally around actual role descriptions.

Much exploratory work of this investigation sought to isolate extreme populations along media, parent, and peer dimensions for the purpose of comparative study. Interaction effects confirmed in the parsimonious model of Chapter 5 provide reason to think that continued description of such populations is a useful task which will enhance understanding of marital role learning. These interaction effects are themselves subject to further exploration. The hypotheses presented here on the basis of graphic indication of the chief interaction effects are merely eyeball estimates based on a few observations per cell. More

disciplined quantitative inquiry is needed, testing for classifications which will enhance the number of observations per cell. Further, the effects could be tested with other classifiers representing media, parents and peers. How firm or widely applicable are the hypotheses?

In addition to further exploration of interaction effects, the hypothesized populations underlying the media and peer dimensions could be explored. Already, the need to qualify the effect of MOVIESED by reference to other classifiers has been indicated in the confirmatory conclusions. What is recommended here is the exploration of those other classifiers as a study to further enhance the understanding of the agent populations. The two media populations--book-oriented and TV-oriented--could be described by exploration of the effects on marital roles when the classifiers are BOOKS and NTREAD on the one hand, and MAGAZINES and NTTV on the other. Careful description of the deviant  $M_1$  cell on MOVIESED may give further clues to the nature of extreme agreement on MOVIESED. The effect of FRENDTIM might be usefully compared to parsimonious models of peer influence when NTGROGRP and NTFRIENDS are used to test the hypothesized difference between more structured peer interactions and the intimacy of friendship. The effect on marital roles, as well as demographic characteristics and relations to other socialization agents, would provide a description of the hypothesized peer sub-samples. Isolation of differences between "dating" and "friendships" as preparation for marriage could be done through systematic exploration based on PRDATING and PRFRIENDS. Also, understanding of peer influence might be enhanced by the description of the characteristics of the significant deviant sample ( $n = 17$ ) who indicated that living together before marriage was influential in marriage preparation.

Thus far, further exploration of underlying populations has been called for to specify the underlying populations, especially in the peer and media dimensions. In addition to such description according to agent samples, a more generalized description seeking comparative samples in terms of levels of communicativeness would usefully test the hypothesis that there is an underlying communication dimension--or openness to experience--which underlies all of the socialization agents. Comparative groups which might be sought could include 1) non-communicators, who are only minimally involved with any socialization agent, 2) media escapist, whose heavy media involvement is indicative of inadequate interpersonal functioning, 3) one-sided inter-personal functioners, whose media use is interpreted in light of dominance of either a) parents or b) peer influence, and 4) functional communicators, who are highly communicative along all three agent dimensions.

Yet another way to clarify underlying populations representing differential agent effects would be to compare patterns of use with patterns of influence. In the theoretical account governing this investigation, the importance of the individual's definitions of the situation was stressed. If influence is not seen as mere stimulus, but as the response of an organism seeking the expression of acts which fulfill its own impulse, the acknowledged influence may differ from mere exposure to an influence source. Influence relates to the complex ways in which affect and positive and negative reinforcements focus one's attention to and interpretation of the presented role model. Thus, attendance at movies may not indicate movie influence as much as attention to the movies as a specific source of learning. Populations described on the basis of agent behaviors might be usefully compared to those described on the basis

of attitude about the agents. For instance, use of the model MOVIA TND-PRNT PHON-FREND TM would heighten attention to behavioral indicators of interaction with movies, parents and peers, but use of the model MOVIE SED-PARNT SIG-LIFESTYL would heighten attention to the perceived influence of the movies which are judged to be an education, or the parents who are considered significant, or the friends whose lifestyle is thought to be similar to one's own. Such comparison would provide a useful indicator of the degree to which quantitative exposure to a role model source is related to the qualitative significance to the one who seeks such models.

Some of the conditions governing that qualitative influence are presented now in terms of hypotheses which summarize the way in which interpersonal and media models become authoritative for persons learning the new roles required in marriage. Hypotheses have already been stated which summarize the description of socialization agents and the exploration of interaction effects. These two sets are now integrated into a few hypotheses which reflect a symbolic interactionist formulation of the media role in adult socialization by reference to the way appropriation of media models is influenced by the dynamics of interpersonal interaction.

H<sub>1</sub>: Extreme acceptance of or resistance to the authority of media models is related to the heightening of either parent or peer authority to the exclusion of the other.

H<sub>1.1</sub>: When parental authority is dominant, then generally movie influence will be resisted.

H<sub>1.1.1</sub>: For a significant sub-population, however, parental authority reinforces the movie influence.

H<sub>1.2</sub>: When peer authority is dominant, then generally movie influence will be supported.

H<sub>2</sub>: In normal adult socialization, media, parents, and peers all serve as role models for marriage, freely informing and influencing one another.

H<sub>2.1</sub>: Media influence is generally moderated by interpersonal control over attention to and interpretation of the media model. The appropriateness of media models is judged from the perspective of authoritative values achieved in early parent-child interaction and continuously referred to ongoing peer and parent interaction, so that the basic values find expression in novel behaviors to meet situational demands.

H<sub>3</sub>: The novel expression of basic values may itself cause a sufficient reorientation to shift the underlying values. Acceptance of or resistance to such emerging new values is strengthened when the relative balance of parent, peer and/or media authority is shifted.

These hypotheses describe dominant trends which seem normative, while still allowing for significant sub-sample deviations. They also are compatible with Blumer's theoretical expectation that parents provide basic values while peers and media have more influence on mores. The greatest amount of interaction of media, parents, and peers, was found for the sexual and marital role dimensions. These are two of the dimensions for which normative expectations have been most pronounced. Thus, it is not surprising that they are so subject to interacting influences.

Further exploration of the role dimensions themselves might indicate, for instance, which of the roles express dominant values and which are mores prone to greater change. Just as the exploratory findings reported in Chapter 4 sought comparative agent samples, further exploration could use multivariate analysis techniques in order to seek comparative samples based on role effects. Certain role expectations have been predicted as the effect of movies. Pushing that effect to its extremes in order to compare, for instance, most liberal and most conservative sexual attitudes, would further test the fit of the confirmatory model of Chapter 5 and add to our knowledge of the relation of the



role dimensions to one another and the agents affecting them. Relating the roles to one another, as recommended in relation to the confirmatory findings, would require an exploratory/confirmatory strategy similar to that used to arrive at the present model of media influence. The fact that the sexual and marital role dimensions exhibited the most influence of movies raises a question worthy of further investigation, although it certainly could not be completed merely through secondary analysis of the present data. Are changes in the sexual and marital roles harbingers of further changes which will ensue in other role dimensions? Or have these areas, subject to the greatest amount of social sanction merely become the last to change in response to changes in other dimensions? Sexual and marital role expectations have been sharply defined. But shifts in the larger social situation have influenced marriage and the family. Male/female division of economic responsibility has become more flexible, there is more leisure, there is currently less stress on economic maintenance, there is greater emphasis on psychology and the way in which personality factors affect the marital relationship, and technologies for contraception have heightened the decision for parenthood as a separate decision from that of marital commitment. These many roles are becoming increasingly more open, interactive roles which allow greater flexibility for the unique dyad. This shift has been enhanced by broad social changes, one of which includes the mass media images as generalized other defining social reality for the broadest possible "audience." The media provide a common world view in the context of which unique variants are worked out. But it is a question bearing further investigation in both current and historical sociology whether the media have indeed been an agent to change mores, serving as the

vanguard of changes in sexual and marital roles, or if the media, precisely because of their dependence on a mass audience, have instead been preservers of the most narrow and conservative role definitions, so that shifts in sexual and marital roles are just now catching up with changes previously occurring on the larger social scale.

#### Synthesis of Confirmatory and Exploratory Conclusions

Now, the conclusions of both phases of the investigation may be summarized and related to one another. That media influence marital roles was confirmed for a wide range of roles when media influence was indicated by self-conscious learning from movies. Further, although thorough investigation of alternative sources of explanation of variance remains to be done, several preliminary tests, which removed the effects of certain demographic variables through analysis of covariance, indicated that the media effect remains. Further exploration is needed of media sub-samples oriented to books or to television before the broad applicability of the movie-related findings can be widened to include other media influences, although the movie classifier was related to both media sub-samples. Role effects were described for six dimensions--sexual, marital, companionate, parental, leisure, and economic--and were not related to one another across dimensions. Such a task might further simplify the model by suggesting the most salient dimensions. The statistical model has been qualified by discussion of substantive significance based on multiple criteria, including graphic indication of cell means.

Also confirmed in the investigation was the 3-way interaction of media, parents, and peers on some variates, especially those reflecting basic value orientation in the sexual and marital dimensions.

Exploration has identified some of the complexity underlying these socialization agents. Two media samples have already been alluded to. There is likelihood of two peer samples as well. Interaction effects with self-conscious learning from movies are based on the way respondents described their relationship to their parents and the amount of time they reported that they spent with a friend. Further exploration is needed to test the applicability of the model beyond the specific classifiers used. Beyond the confirmatory evidence of interaction effects, however, considerable evidence was uncovered in exploration of the relations of socialization agent variables to one another and of the effect of movies with different levels of parent and peer influence to indicate that media, parents, and peers are usefully combined in an account of marital socialization.

Perhaps the strongest recommendation, in light of the conclusions reported here, is that media influence on marital roles is indeed worthy of further investigation. Although many further studies might fruitfully explore the data in the Marital Style Inventory to refine further the confirmation and to suggest further hypotheses, probably the most fruitful research will be that which builds on the hypotheses and conclusions presented here in a combined strategy of survey analysis and case study to zero in on various aspects of marital socialization. The broad hypotheses have been confirmed, indicating that the area is fruitful both for the understanding of marriage role learning and of media communication. Detailed knowledge of variables and relationships may be mapped out.

## IMPLICATIONS

What implications may now be drawn from the exploratory and confirmatory conclusions just reported and summarized? Implications for research and theory and practice are now presented.

### For Research

A fruitful line of investigation has been opened up. Not only were the two hypotheses of the investigation confirmed, but also further hypotheses and questions were opened up. An exploratory/confirmatory research style was also demonstrated which holds promise for future investigation. Now these implications are examined in detail.

A fruitful line of investigation has been opened up. In the study of socialization for marriage, taken from an adult socialization perspective, it has been demonstrated that media variables are useful in accounting for variance in marital roles. Further, for at least some roles, the media influence must be viewed in relation to the parent and peer socialization agents which have already played such a significant role in the socialization literature. Of course, other variables are important in accounting for variation in marital roles, including age, sex, length married, religiosity. But the fact remains that the marriage and family literature on preparation for marriage must take more adequate account of media influence in its research, and not merely in its practical concern. This investigation indicates that at least the movies can serve as an important indicator of shifting social definitions. Little research has been done to indicate the social values expressed in the media of art, music, and their combination in

film. Such research would be useful, in light of the findings of this study. The impact of the marriage and family literature itself, especially as its insights become increasingly popularized, would be a subject of interest and value.

Beyond the field in which this investigation was grounded, that of marital socialization, the confirmation that media variables account for variation in marriage roles has implications for further research in the communications field. Media research has often focused on the details of communicating particular messages. Little investigation has been done of the impact of media on the emerging lifestyle which one can picture through a global presentation of social role expectations. Beyond their influence on a particular issue, the fact that certain issues are dealt with and not others has an effect on one's options. The fruitfulness of a socialization approach to communications study is indicated, including the socialization of particular patterns of communication and information seeking and processing.

Some hypotheses and questions bear further examination. Some specific hypotheses have already been reported in the "Conclusions and Recommendations" section of this chapter. Some larger questions which emerge out of reflection on the conclusions have been stated as hypotheses bearing further examination.

1. *The specific interactions of the marital dyad determine the extent to which media role models are emulated or resisted.* Symbolic interactionist criticism of survey research has been that the survey isolates individual responses from what is basically an interactional situation. The effect of parents and peers has been confirmed; there is undoubtedly an effect of the spouse as agent of socialization. One would assume that there would be greater similarity of role prescriptions

with greater number of years married, since the spouse would have had more opportunity for socialization from the partner. The study of media effect must move beyond the global description given here to detailed specification of the way in which media roles are related to specific interaction settings, such as dating, and to specific scripted behavior, such as sexual communication.

2. *Media models have most influence on mores, but these models are perceived and responded to from the frame of reference of underlying values learned largely from parents in childhood socialization.* This hypothesis from Blumer bears further testing. Much of the exploratory data points toward confirmation of this hypothesis, but explicit formulation of research to test this would be useful. The assumption that symbolic expressions give rise to behavior changes is not unusual for historians, but scientific research has largely ignored it. Whether one assigns causality to media symbols or not, art experiences are important indicators of cultural values and scripted behavioral mores. Content analysis of the mass media can provide one important source of documentation of social change. The question of when such change constitutes merely a shift of mores, and when a change of fundamental values, is a difficult one. The difficulty of the task, however, should not preclude it from investigation. It is at the heart of the socialization concern and shifting sexual and marital mores are one important testing ground for exploration of the hypothesis.

3. *Habitual patterns of information-seeking and meaning-appropriation which govern a person's communication style are themselves subject to socialization.* Research is needed that will relate a person's fundamental habits of symbolic transformation to personality variables which takes account of fundamental human interaction with significant others.

The relation of significant symbol and significant others is crucial. A dramatic indication of this was the way in which Hitler's symbolic portrayal of a master race was related to the systematic exclusion of certain persons from the social reality "human race." The fact that both the isolate and the dependent person, persons unusually close to parents or peers, or persons unusually distant from them are subject to more media influence is one important indicator that the relation of interpersonal functioning and symbolically mediated experience bears further investigation. Another important indicator was the high degree of intercorrelation of all of the socialization agent dimensions. Good communication with parents is related to good communication with peers is related to realistic participation in symbolic communication that is mediated through non-personal sources. More attention needs to be given in the socialization literature to the habits of communication which are themselves learned. For instance, what use do parents make of symbolic material, including books, television, and movies in the childhood socialization process? How does such use set limits on or facilitate adult role learning? What is needed is research beyond the mere question of whether behavior may be learned from media, or which behavior is learned, to the problem identified by Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson (1967) as "deutero-learning," how one learns to learn behavior from media. Such research would prove valuable for parents and educators who want to teach adequate coping styles in a symbolic environment saturated with media images.

4. *A shift in marital and sexual mores is related to a shift in other roles of marriage, thus indicating the emergence of a new style of marriage.* Research which takes symbolic definition of the situation

seriously must be prepared to examine complex interrelations of these definitions. This is increasingly difficult as the trend toward more interactive roles and away from the prescribed social roles continues. In the data examined in this investigation the largest shift was in the sexual and marital roles. Does this shift anticipate shifts in other roles? Or are these more highly controlled role expectations finally yielding to changes already made in other roles? Did the sexual and marital roles shift most because these are the roles most portrayed in the cinema? What effect will the heightening of the sexual role and the questioning of marriage mores have on the total role constellation which constitutes marriage? Does the motion picture heighten the romantic aspect of marriage, thus taking sexual relationships and the commitment of marriage covenants out of the context of ongoing economic and parental roles? How many films, for example, explore the sexual expression of parents who have a youngster or two wandering around the house? Or the meaning of marriage when the husband cannot work and the wife is critically ill? Is the shift which MOVIESED detected in sexual and marital roles on the part of those for whom movies have been an education related to the ambiguity in the sample over child-rearing roles or economic values? Such questions indicate the need for a major line of investigation which continues to pursue the relation of symbolically mediated experience to the ongoing socialization of social and interactive roles.

An exploratory/confirmatory research style has been demonstrated.

Many of the above hypotheses and questions have not been tackled, partly because of their complexity. Yet significant areas of investigation should not be avoided just because they do not easily fit into the



rigorous methodologies of hypothesis testing. A research style has been demonstrated which is both exploratory and confirmatory. It can be used in an interactive style in which the results of simultaneous research/theory/practice can be referred to one another. The comparative design used here was placed in the context of survey and experimental research. It recognized that the state of the question and the ambiguity about the operational variables may demand different research strategies for different stages of investigation. Few of the hypotheses stated above have been operationalized and tested by researchers. The powerful tools for abstraction made available through multivariate techniques allow the investigator to deal more adequately with the complexity of a dynamic, multifaceted world. The research style demonstrated here has made flexible use of probability statistics not merely to confirm hypotheses, but also to indicate possible relations of interest. Graphic indication has been used as a means of "looking" to see what is there in the data. This kind of research model will be needed to use the tools of experiment-oriented hypothesis testing in order to penetrate new problem areas in which variables are as yet poorly operationalized.

#### For Theory

Symbolic interactionist theory is a useful framework for examining the interrelations of media, parent, and peer influences on marriage roles. The adult socialization perspective is a useful framework for the study of media influence on marital socialization. Further specification of media influence on marital roles may be carried on in context of this theoretical perspective.

Symbolic interactionism is a useful framework in which to explore media, parent, and peer influences on role learning. Confirmation of the hypothesis that media influence marital roles and the secondary hypothesis that they do so in interaction with parents and peers sustains the insights of the symbolic interactionist position. Symbolic, as well as interpersonal, variables are important in dealing with human behavior. Any account of human behavior must include symbolic definitions of the situation as well as the actual behavior reported. Media and interpersonal variables must both be included in a socialization model. This extends the insights of the family theorists who have seen the family as an interacting unity; it places the family as a unit in society, subject to certain social definitions in the cultural influences upon that family.

This meeting of communication and socialization theories is not an entirely new development. Ruesch & Bateson (1968) and Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson, (1967) fruitfully combined media communications theory and psychiatric insights in probing media communication as a problem of social psychological investigation. But such cross-disciplinary insight has not informed the bulk of social psychological investigation into marriage and the family. The marriage and family literature will be enhanced if its theoretical accounts of family relations and marriage socialization can be extended to include the dynamics of inter- and intra-personal incorporation of transpersonally mediated symbols (to use terms from Ruesch & Bateson (1968), p. 273f). Further, the literature of mass communication research will be enhanced by further attention in theory construction to the personal and family dimensions which must be accounted for. Such attention must move beyond

merely treating the family as one variable affecting the persuasive power of the media message. It must examine the way in which the media images are used by the family in the socialization process as they help the growing child into an awareness of the social roles that are available in the settings in which the family is situated.

The systematic linking of intra-, inter-, and trans-personal symbolic communication is necessary for a full account of the social psychology of mediated experience. Such a task will be useful for the family theorist who seeks to place the family in its wider context. The question most often asked has been, "What is the 'effect' on the family of the media input?" The more significant question is rather, "How does the family define itself through its interaction with the symbolic experience it creates and/or appropriates?" Media is only one source of such symbolic definitions which provide ideologies and lifestyles by which the family lives. This investigation has clear theoretical implications beyond its media application to marital roles. Wherever symbolic expressions affect social behavior, whether in the media, in the arts, or in religiously rooted visions of reality, the intricate interplay of symbolic definitions of the situation and the completion of social acts in human interaction must be accounted for. Symbolic interactionism is an important formulation in that direction.

The use of multivariate data analysis as an exploratory/confirmatory tool stands in the tradition of symbolic interactionist concern to find a methodology adequate to the full empirical social reality of the experienced world. The theoretical implications of methodology must be accounted for and extensive work on this has been done in Chapter 2. The abstractive tools and disciplines of multivariate

data analysis have grown up out of careful experimentation to test specific hypotheses. Such tools, however, must be used with a careful awareness of the limits of that abstraction at all stages of the investigation, and not merely at the point of error due to sampling. The very statement of the research question is itself part of the limitation whereby error enters in. The choice of certain operational variables is another limitation. Measurement is another. The methodology demonstrated here indicates the way one investigator used the mathematical tools to carry on a symbolic interaction with the social world in order to wrest from it some discovery which shall influence further lines of action in that social reality.

Adult socialization is a useful framework for studying the role of media in marital socialization. The limitations of media influence are similar to the limits on adult socialization. For both, the prior conditioning of childhood socialization must be taken into account. The placing of media study in the context of a socialization account has advantages in the following ways.

First, media is seen beyond its role of mere information transmission in terms of its potentially powerful role in aiding symbolic transformation. Media communications theory which concentrates chiefly on "effects," even though the role of intervening interpersonal variables in achieving those effects is recognized, is not adequate for an account of marital socialization. The symbolic interactionist account of socialization leads us to believe that role acquisition is more than a matter of learning new information. It is the active engagement of a person with social reality in creating a unique self out of the forum of "me" expectations learned from others. In an information transmission

model, error is treated as "noise." It is a miscommunication, a failure for the message to get through. The stress is on mere repetition of a stimulus and duplication of correct expectations and information. Marriage theorists indicate, however, that marital roles are increasingly open, rather than closed. Carefully scripted social roles are giving way to the interactive roles allowing for unique acting out in the situation. This process, when viewed in terms of Suzanne Langer's categories, is to be seen, not as "noise" in the communication channel, but as symbolic transformation,<sup>5</sup> the very essence of what it means to be human! That is why symbolic interactionism is so significant for communication theory as it moves away from a "hypodermic needle" model to a socialization model. In such a shift, the importance of play and of individual creativity will be increasingly recognized. Through fantasy, the inner rehearsal of new roles, media provide opportunity for symbolic play. The social self is achieved through the creative interplay of symbolic play and the realities of roles acted out in social interaction.

The way in which media enter the socialization process is through the manipulation of social symbols in order to achieve social cultural expectations. The role of manipulation of basic biological functioning toward social ends has long been a basic tenet in socialization research. Freudian theory of psychosexual development is a prime example of this. Theory regarding the manipulation of social products and symbolic functioning to achieve social ends is not as well developed. Organizational and interpersonal dynamics have been widely studied in family literature, but little attention has been paid to the value of art and

---

<sup>5</sup> Langer (1951) first discusses "symbolic transformation" at p. 47f.

cultural experiences as influencers of socialization. Again, to use Langer's term, the media provide symbols which are "expressive forms."<sup>6</sup> They give expression to basic feeling and valuing. They become depositories of recurrent human themes with their varying interpersonal role expectations. Content analysis already assumes this, in that a medium of communication is studied for the basic attitudes which are expressed therein. The assumption is that these attitudes are behavior-related. "Expressive form" makes available certain experience. The literature on marriage and the family is a good place to study the themes of media to determine the typical family and marriage role definitions that underlie them. Much more attention is needed in socialization studies on the media as generalized other which defines social reality by focusing attention and memory in perceptual and learning processes.

Such study will facilitate better understanding of the way in which childhood socialization and adult socialization relate to one another. Through focus on social symbols and their influence on role learning, the same dynamics may be used to account for both the continuity of dominant values achieved through childhood interaction with parents and the potential for change implicit in the adult socialization approach.

Theoretical account of marital socialization must continue to account for the dominance of parental values, at the same time it allows for the emergence of those values in the "play" of new forms through which novelty emerges and new mores come to expression, continuous with the values of the past.

---

<sup>6</sup> The term is borrowed from Suzanne K. Langer (1953), *Feeling and Form*.

Symbolic interactionism may be used further to specify media influence on marital roles. Much of the anxiety over media influence as a contradiction to the influences of home, school and church, was rooted in an individualistic model which clearly cannot be held in light of the interactions reported in this investigation of media and parents and peers. Rather than being a strong influence to anti-social behavior, the roles most influenced indicate that media may actually enhance personal sharing and dialogue. They are related to greater self-revelation, to development of intimacy, to shared meanings through the sharing of common symbolic experiences. Three of the four role prescriptions most strongly and clearly affected were these:

Sex is a subject of and a means of open communication.  
The sexual relationship is to be valued and worked at.  
Companionate, personal sharing is facilitated.

This open, communicational approach to marriage may, in fact, be part of the openness to new forms and the flexibility regarding legal and social sanctions which define marriage. It is the communication, the live interchange of personal meanings which defines the marriage relationship and not primarily the legal or social sanctions. Although such sanctions are still valued, they are not seen as definitive. Thus, there may be more openness to living together before marriage because that is seen as a step in the marriage act which tests the communication. Once that is established, the legal definition may follow. Fears of past researchers that the movies undermine the family, economic support roles, and committed sexuality were not supported. Surprisingly, the movies had little effect on some fundamental values expressed in marriage and the family. Whether sex is sacred and/or for the purpose of procreation, the relative salience of marital vs. parental roles, the importance of

child rearing, and the weight of economic or personal factors in choice of a job--all of these areas in which the sample at large illustrated considerable ambiguity were relatively uninfluenced by movies, as well as by parents and peers.

In the dyad's media-enhanced interpersonal communication, shifts in marital and sexual roles must be related to other roles in further theory. The theoretical account of this investigation concentrated on providing explanation *that* media influenced roles, and that *in relation* to parents and peers. Since that account has been sustained, it is possible to specify further the role relationships within that account. Into what total marriage context must we fit more open communication about sex and less objection to violation of social sanctions? How are the economic, parental, and companionate roles affected by shifts in the sexual and marital roles? Why were not effects on the parental roles more pronounced, as would have been expected from the account of Hill & Aldous? Theoretical exploration of these questions, accompanied by research into the same will enhance the symbolic interactionist account of media influence on marital roles.

In this task of further specification, a general theory of social psychology of media experience will be expounded and related to basic personality variables which affect a person's characteristic learning/coping/communicating style. Such a learning theory will not only account for the imitation of role models, but also for the impulse which causes the person to seek models, not only for the physiological response to violent behavior, but also for the psychological definitions of the situation which give meanings to the violent act.



### For Practice

The concern of practitioners in the marriage and family field that media do have influence on marital roles is justified; but widespread alarm is not called for. Of special concern for religious educators, movies may be used in a teaching and/or counseling strategy, and the research style exhibited here may be used to advance research and theory in the practical field of religious education.

Concern about media influence is justified. The media classifier MOVIESED was very useful in accounting for variation in marital roles. This influence of movies as education for marriage was most pronounced in the areas of sexual and marital roles. But in the very areas where the one-way media influence was most pronounced, there were the most interaction effects with the parent and peer classifiers. Focus on media effects, then, must continue to be related to the total interpersonal milieu of the person being influenced. Practitioners who are aware of the effects of media could usefully channel their concern that media per se have influence into sensitive attention to the uses made of media by the person in his style of relating to the social world. Also, one might be concerned if media were the only means of preparation available to a person. By the strong focus on the romance of sexual roles and the openness to new definitions of marriage, there may be danger of the social object "marriage" itself becoming narrowed by exclusive attention to only certain aspects of the marriage relationship. But the movies also seem to be a stimulus to greater sharing of personal experience, an enhancer of the intimate relationship so necessary for effective functioning in marriage.

Widespread alarm is not called for. The fears underlying much early research on media effects are not justified. Basic values have held up fairly well. The influences reported here were not radical changes. The more liberal sex attitudes of the "movie-educated" were not too much different from the generally high valuation of sexual communication and of sex as play for the sample as a whole. The lesser resistance to violation of social sanctions regarding marriage on the part of the "movie-educated" was nevertheless not far from the general resistance on the part of the sample as a whole to redefinition of marriage. Many areas of ambiguity are reflected in the sample and are not clarified by the movies' seemingly more humanistic, psychologically and expressively oriented approach. The basic orientation of the family toward child-rearing has surprisingly remained untouched despite the romantic notions of sex and marriage in the media and despite the salience of the marital dimension. There is still a strong underlying commitment to families and childrearing as an important vocation. Also, in the economic roles, there is ambiguity about the roles of man and wife, especially in light of the more liberated sexual image of woman, and about the role of economic earning and occupational pay and prestige and advancement, over against the more personal values of personal fulfillment and satisfaction. Marriage itself as an institution has stood up well. The fears of the Blumer and other reports of the Payne Fund studies are not finally vindicated. Indications are that the values have held up surprisingly well, plus a few new values have been added which may be useful, e.g., limitation of family size because of global considerations, and natural childbirth. Differing attitudes about sex and marriage were not necessarily associated with rebellion

against parents. Dating is a parent-sanctioned event. Exploration of the interaction effects indicated that parental influence can still be decisive in one's acceptance or rejection of media models, despite the often observed tendency for media influence, supported by peer influence, to be in a direction opposite parental influence. What is suggested to the practitioner concerned about the inadequacy of media models for marriage is to work at basic interpersonal relationships, using the media as common experience which may be shared. In the sharing persons may be helped to define the social reality by which they shall live, the role models they will incorporate into the inner forum as they work out their own interactive roles.

Movies facilitate personal sharing. This finding may be used effectively by religious educators and others in counseling and education. This is probably one of the most practical findings of this investigation. It is useful to any educator or counselor, but especially to the religious educator. Nearly three-eighths of the sample indicated that movies had been an education for their marriage. Less than a quarter, even among this highly educated sample, indicated that a course had been influential in their preparation for marriage. Use of feature movies which couples are already likely to be attending in a strategy of pre-marital counsel, or even when socialization is needed in re-defining marriage roles in a failing marriage, would be a helpful way to foster spouse-to-spouse communication as they work out their own expectations in dialogue regarding the role models of the film. In addition to the greater personal sharing which was found on the part of those for whom movies had been an education, many variables which represented relatively new issues or trends, e.g., response to the population crisis, liberality on abortion

or the women's movement, preference for natural childbirth, were affected by the movie education. This further supports research evidence previously reported that the media may be most persuasive on new issues about which persons do not have previously thought out attitudes and responses. The educator and counselor can use new issues as the point where value clarification may occur. For instance, film experiences exploring abortion or the role of women may provide a public forum on values to clarify the expectations which are incorporated in the inner forum where old values find new expression. Such exploration benefits by and contributes to the ongoing task of theological reflections. Use of media events to enhance communication about personal values and the way in which they find expression in relation to emerging issues has wider implications than merely socialization for marital roles. Especially when marriage is shifting toward more focus on the interactive roles, rather than the closed social role prescriptions of the past, training at the level of communicative behavior generally, and not merely at the specific level of marriage roles is called for.

A research style has been demonstrated that is useful for research and theory building in the context of practice. Such a style is needed, especially in religious education where there has been little research and theory development. The iterative, exploratory/confirmatory style of research is suited to the conduct of research in the practical setting. One may gather information en route, being careful to describe the sample at all points. Hypotheses may be formulated and tested; theory may be constructed. There is a paucity of information systematically gathered in church-related research. Secondary analysis of survey

data allows economical use of the information which is gathered. Much research on religion has occurred at the level of the outside observer, a spectator examining the phenomena of unusual and quaint religious experiences, or studying the institutional variables of the religious bodies. There has been little examination of the experience of religion from the participant observer viewpoint. Symbolic interactionist insistence that the investigator clarify the assumptions underlying his own symbolic interaction with the world provides a framework in which a religious educator may be more scientific and empirical, while not having to discard symbolic definitions of the human situation which include interactions with God as well as man. The research style demonstrated here provides a model whereby a practicing religious educator may be at once more scientific and more theological. The Word becomes flesh, attitude becomes act, symbol becomes reality. But there is a constant making of things new. Reality is in process of being shaped. And the self-conscious scientific method is one means of discovering and taking responsibility for the larger realities into which our research probes and whose statement our theories approximate and the living with which our practice serves.

## R E F E R E N C E S

- Aberle, D. F. 1961. "Culture and socialization." In F. L. K. Hsu (ed.) PSYCHOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY: APPROACHES TO CULTURE AND PERSONALITY. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press, p. 381-97.
- American Psychological Association. 1966. STANDARDS FOR EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS AND MANUALS. Washington.
- Anscombe, F. J. 1973. "Graphs in statistical analysis." AMERICAN STATISTICIAN, 27:17f.
- Baldwin, J. M. 1906. MENTAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE CHILD AND THE RACE. New York: Macmillan.
- Ball, G. H. 1965. "Data analysis in the social sciences: What about the details?" AFIPS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS, 27:533-59. Washington: Spartan Books.
- Bandura, A., D. Ross, and S. A. Ross. 1961. "Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models." JOURNAL OF ABNORMAL AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 63:575-82.
- Bauer, R. A. 1964. "The obstinate audience: The influence process from the point of view of social communication." AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST, 19:319-28.
- Bayer, A. E. 1969. "Life plans and marriage age: An application of path analysis." JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND FAMILY, 31:551-58.
- Becker, H. S. 1961. BOYS IN WHITE: STUDENT CULTURE IN MEDICAL SCHOOL. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. "Personal changes in adult life." SOCIOMETRY, 27:40-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. SOCIOLOGICAL WORK: METHOD AND SUBSTANCE. Chicago: Aldine.
- Bee, L. S. 1952. "Evaluating education for marriage and family living." MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIVING, 14:97-103.
- Berelson, B. 1949. "Events as an influence on public opinion." JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 26:145-48.
- Berkowitz, L., R. Corwin, and M. Heironimus. 1963. "Film violence and subsequent aggressive tendencies." PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 27:217-29.
- Blalock, H. M. 1960. SOCIAL STATISTICS. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. CAUSAL INFERENCES IN NONEXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH. 2d ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Blumer, H. 1933. MOVIES AND CONDUCT. New York: Macmillan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1935. "Moulding of mass behavior through the motion picture." PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY, 29:115-27.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1959. "Suggestions for the study of mass media effects." In E. Burdick and A. J. Brodbeck (eds.) *AMERICAN VOTING BEHAVIOR*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, p. 197-208.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1966. "Sociological implications of the thought of George Herbert Mead." *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY*, 71:535-44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1969. "The methodological position of symbolic interactionism." *SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM: PERSPECTIVES AND METHOD*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Bock, R. D. 1967. "Remarks on analysis of variance and analysis of regression." Symposium on the general linear model approach and the analysis of experiments in educational research, held at the Holiday Inn, Athens, Georgia, June 29-30, 1967. Unpublished lecture manuscript.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. *MULTIVARIATE STATISTICAL METHODS IN BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Borko, H. (ed.) 1962. *COMPUTER APPLICATIONS IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1965. "Integrating computers into behavioral science research." *AFIPS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS*, 27:527-32. Washington: Spartan Books.
- Bowman, H. 1960. "Education for marriage: An overview." In H. T. Morse and P. L. Dressel (eds.) *GENERAL EDUCATION FOR PERSONAL MATURITY*. Dubuque, IA: Brown, p. 146-57.
- Brim, O. G., Jr. 1959. *EDUCATION FOR CHILD REARING*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. "Socialization through the life cycle." *SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL ITEMS*, 18:1-5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1968a. "Adult socialization." In *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SOCIAL SCIENCES*, 14:555-62. New York: Macmillan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1968b. "Adult socialization." In J. A. Clausen (ed.) *SOCIALIZATION AND SOCIETY*. Boston: Little, Brown, p. 182-226.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and S. Wheeler. 1966. *SOCIALIZATION AFTER CHILDHOOD: TWO ESSAYS*. New York: Wiley.
- Broderick, C. B. 1966. "Socio-sexual development in a suburban community." *JOURNAL OF SEX RESEARCH*, 2:1-24.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. 1970. *TWO WORLDS OF CHILDHOOD: US AND USSR*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Brown, D., R. E. James, Jr., and G. Reeves. 1971. *PROCESS PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIAN THOUGHT*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.



- Burgess, E. W. 1934. "The sources and methods of family study."  
In L. L. Bernard (ed.) THE FIELDS AND METHODS OF SOCIOLOGY. New  
York: Long and Smith, p. 440-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_, H. J. Locke and M. M. Thomes. 1971. THE FAMILY: FROM  
TRADITIONAL TO COMPANIONSHIP. New York: Van Nostrand, Reinhold.
- Burr, W. R. 1973. THEORY CONSTRUCTION AND THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE FAMILY.  
New York: Wiley.
- Campbell, D. T. 1957. "Factors relevant to the validity of experiments  
in social settings." PSYCHOLOGICAL BULLETIN, 54:297-312.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. "From description to experimentation: Interpreting  
trends as quasi-experiments." In C. W. Harris (ed.) PROBLEMS IN  
MEASURING CHANGE. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and J. S. Stanley. 1963. "Experimental and quasi-experimental  
designs for research on teaching." In N. L. Gage (ed.) HANDBOOK OF  
RESEARCH ON TEACHING. Chicago: Rand McNally, p. 171-246.
- Cattell, R. B. (ed.) 1966. HANDBOOK OF MULTIVARIATE EXPERIMENTAL  
PSYCHOLOGY. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Chaffee, S. H. 1972. "The interpersonal context of mass communication."  
In F. G. Kline and P. J. Tichenor (eds.) CURRENT PERSPECTIVES IN  
MASS COMMUNICATION RESEARCH. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- \_\_\_\_\_, L. S. Ward, and L. P. Tipton. 1970. "Mass communication and  
political socialization." JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 47:647-59.
- Chapin, F. 1955. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH. Rev. ed.  
New York: Harper & Row.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and S. A. Queen. 1937. RESEARCH MEMORANDUM ON SOCIAL WORK IN  
THE DEPRESSION. New York: Social Science Research Council,  
Bulletin 39.
- Chave, E. J. 1931. "Tests and measurements in religious education."  
In Lotz, P. H. (ed.) STUDIES IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. Nashville:  
Cokesbury, p. 129-49.
- Christensen, H. T. 1964. "Development of the family field of study."  
In H. T. Christensen (ed.) HANDBOOK OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY.  
Chicago: Rand McNally, p. 3-32.
- Clark, W. H. 1960. "Research in religious education." In M. J. Taylor  
(ed.) AN INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. Nashville: Abingdon  
Press, p. 78-86.
- Clausen, J. (ed.) 1968. SOCIALIZATION AND SOCIETY. Boston: Little,  
Brown.
- Cobb, J. B., Jr. 1965. A CHRISTIAN NATURAL THEOLOGY. Philadelphia:  
Westminster Press.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967. THE STRUCTURE OF CHRISTIAN EXISTENCE. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1969. GOD AND THE WORLD. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1975. CHRIST IN A PLURALISTIC AGE. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Coe, G. A. 1902. THE RELIGION OF A MATURE MIND. Chicago: Revell.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1916. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1929. WHAT IS CHRISTIAN EDUCATION? New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Committee on Family Life. 1972. "Family." THE BOOK OF RESOLUTIONS OF THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, 1972. Nashville: United Methodist Publishing House, p. 109-19.
- Compaan, A. 1973. A STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY YOUNG ADULT MARITAL STYLES AS FOUND AMONG A SELECT SAMPLE OF CHURCH-RELATED COUPLES. Ph.D. Dissertation, School of Theology at Claremont.
- Cooley, C. H. 1956. TWO MAJOR WORKS: SOCIAL ORGANIZATION (&) HUMAN NATURE AND THE SOCIAL ORDER. With an introduction by R. C. Angell. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Cooley, W., and P. Lohnes. 1971. MULTIVARIATE DATA ANALYSIS. New York: Wiley.
- Culkin, J. M. 1965. FILM STUDY IN THE HIGH SCHOOL. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Dager, E. Z. 1964. "Socialization and personality development in the child." In H. T. Christensen (ed.) HANDBOOK OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY. Chicago: Rand McNally, p. 740-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. SOCIALIZATION: PROCESS, PRODUCT, AND CHANGE. Chicago: Markham.
- Danziger, Kurt. 1971. SOCIALIZATION. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Davitz, J. R., and L. J. Davitz. 1967. A GUIDE FOR EVALUATING RESEARCH PLANS IN PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dean, J. P., R. L. Eichhorn, and L. R. Dean. 1967. "The survey." In J. T. Doby (ed.) AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL RESEARCH. 2d ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- De Groot, A. D. 1969. (See Groot, A. D. de.)
- Denzin, N. K. 1970a. THE RESEARCH ACT: A THEORETICAL INTRODUCTION AND SOCIOLOGICAL METHODS. Chicago: Aldine.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970b. SOCIOLOGICAL METHODS: A SOURCEBOOK. Chicago: Aldine.
- Deutscher, I. 1962. "Socialization for postparental life." In A. M. Rose (ed.) HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL PROCESSES. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, p. 506-25.
- Dewey, J. 1916. DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION. New York: Macmillan.
- Donohue, J. E. 1971. Sources of sexuality concept formation among high school students. Denver: University of Denver, Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Duncan, H. D. 1962. COMMUNICATION AND SOCIAL ORDER. New York: Bedminster Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1968. SYMBOLS IN SOCIETY. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Elkin, F. 1960. THE CHILD AND SOCIETY: THE PROCESS OF SOCIALIZATION. New York: Random House.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and G. Handel. 1972. THE CHILD AND SOCIETY: THE PROCESS OF SOCIALIZATION. 2d ed. New York: Random House.
- Elliott, H. S. 1940. CAN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION BE CHRISTIAN? New York: Macmillan.
- Ellis, A. 1956. "A critical evaluation of marriage counseling." MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIVING, 18:65-71.
- Emery, F. E. 1959. "Psychological effects of the Western film: A study in television viewing: II. The experimental study." HUMAN RELATIONS, 12:215-32.
- England, R. W., Jr. 1960. "Images of love and courtship in family-magazine fiction." MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIVING, 22:162-65.
- Erikson, E. 1968. IDENTITY: YOUTH AND CRISIS. New York: Norton.
- European Committee on Crime Problems, 1968. THE CINEMA AND THE PROTECTION OF YOUTH. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- "The family life educator of the future." 1971. FAMILY COORDINATOR, 20:315-24.
- Folsom, J. K. 1941. YOUTH, FAMILY AND EDUCATION. Washington: American Council on Education.
- Forcese, D. P., and S. Richer (eds.) 1970. STAGES OF SOCIAL RESEARCH: CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Forsey, S. D. 1963. "Plan 5. The influence of family structures upon the patterns and effects of family viewing." In L. Arons and M. A. May (eds.) TELEVISION AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, p. 64-80.

- Gagnon, J. H., and W. Simon. 1973. SEXUAL CONDUCT: THE SOCIAL SOURCES OF HUMAN SEXUALITY. Chicago: Aldine.
- Glaser, B. G., and A. L. Strauss. 1967. DISCOVERY OF GROUNDED THEORY: STRATEGIES FOR QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH. Chicago: Aldine.
- Glock, C. Y. 1967. SURVEY RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Goffman, E. 1974. FRAME ANALYSIS: AN ESSAY ON THE ORGANIZATION OF EXPERIENCE. Cambridge, MA: Howard University Press..
- Griffin, D. R. 1973. A PROCESS CHRISTOLOGY. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Groot, A. D. de. 1969. METHODOLOGY. The Hague: Mouton.
- Harris, C. W. 1969. "Statistical methods." In R. L. Ebel (ed.) ENCYCLOPEDIA OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan, p. 1307-18.
- Harrison, F. 1970. "The process of conducting research: Procedures and proceedings." Paper read for the American Personnel and Guidance Association pre-session on: Research supervision and consultation, November 8-10, Chicago, Illinois.
- Hays, W. L. 1968. "Statistical theory." ANNUAL REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY, 19:417-36. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. STATISTICS FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES. 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hendrick, C., and R. A. Jones. 1972. THE NATURE OF THEORY AND RESEARCH IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. New York: Academic Press.
- Hereford, C. F. 1963. CHANGING PARENTAL ATTITUDES THROUGH GROUP DISCUSSION. Austin, TX: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.
- Hill, R. and J. Aldous. 1969. "Socialization for marriage and parenthood." In D. A. Goslin (ed.) HANDBOOK OF SOCIALIZATION THEORY AND RESEARCH. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Hill, R. and D. Hansen. 1960. "The identification of conceptual frameworks utilized in family study." MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIVING, 22:299-311.
- Himmelweit, H., A. N. Oppenheim, and P. Vince. 1958. TELEVISION AND THE CHILD: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF TELEVISION ON THE YOUNG. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hines, R. L. 1973. "Marital Style Inventory: Exploratory data analysis with special attention to: 1) Media and preparation for marriage, 2) Movies and attitudes toward sex and marriage, 3) Pre-marital cohabitation and attitudes toward sex." Unpublished manuscript, February 15.

- Hirschi, T., and H. C. Selvin. 1973. PRINCIPLES OF SURVEY ANALYSIS (Formerly titled DELINQUENCY RESEARCH). New York: Free Press.
- Holland, D. 1970. "Familization, socialization, and the universe of meaning: An extension of the interactional approach to the study of the family." JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY, 32:415-27.
- Homans, G. 1965. "Group factors in worker productivity." In H. Proshansky and B. Seidenberg (eds.) BASIC STUDIES IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, p. 592-604.
- Horton, D. 1957. "The dialogue of courtship in popular songs." AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, 58:569-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and R. R. Wohl. 1956. "Mass communication and para-social interaction." PSYCHIATRY, 19:215.
- Hovland, C. I. 1954. "Effects of the mass media of communication." In G. Lindzey (ed.) HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 2:1062-1103. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Howe, R. L. 1953. MAN'S NEED AND GOD'S ACTION. Greenwich, CT: Seabury Press.
- Hyman, H. H. 1955. SURVEY DESIGN AND ANALYSIS. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. SECONDARY ANALYSIS OF SURVEY DATA. New York: Wiley.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973-74. "Mass communication and socialization." PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 37:524-40.
- Jacoby, A. P. 1969. "Transition to parenthood: A reassessment." JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND FAMILY, 31:720-27.
- Katz, D. 1953. "Field studies." In L. Festinger and D. Katz (eds.) RESEARCH METHODS IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, p. 56-97.
- Katz, E. 1957. "The two-step flow of communication: An up-to-date report on an hypothesis." In H. Proshansky and B. Seidenberg (eds.) BASIC STUDIES IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965, p. 196-209. From PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 21:61-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and P. F. Lazarsfeld. 1955. PERSONAL INFLUENCE. New York: Free Press.
- Kendall, P. and P. F. Lazarsfeld. 1950. "Problems of Survey Analysis." In R. K. Merton and P. F. Lazarsfeld (eds.) CONTINUITIES IN SOCIAL RESEARCH. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Keppel, Geoffrey. 1973. DESIGN AND ANALYSIS: A RESEARCHER'S HANDBOOK. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

- Kerckhoff, Alan C. 1972. *SOCIALIZATION AND SOCIAL CLASS*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. 1969. "Research in education." In R. L. Ebel (ed.) *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH*, 4th ed. New York: Macmillan, p. 1127-1144.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. *FOUNDATION OF BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH*, 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Kirk, R. E. 1968. *EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN: PROCEDURES FOR THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Kish, L. 1959. "Some statistical problems in research design." *AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW*, 24:328-38. Reprinted in D. P. Forcese and S. Richer (eds.) *STAGES OF SOCIAL RESEARCH*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Klapper, J. T. 1960. *THE EFFECTS OF MASS COMMUNICATION*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Kline, F. G. 1972. "Theory in mass communication research." In F. G. Kline and P. J. Tichenor (eds.) *CURRENT PERSPECTIVES IN MASS COMMUNICATION RESEARCH*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Komarovsky, M. 1964. *BLUE-COLLAR MARRIAGE*. 2d ed. New York: Random House.
- Kracauer, S. 1960. *THEORY OF FILM: THE REDEMPTION OF PHYSICAL REALITY*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kruskal, W. H. 1968. "Statistics--the field." In *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SOCIAL SCIENCES*, 15:206-224. New York: Macmillan and Free Press.
- Kuhn, M. H. 1964. "Major trends in symbolic interaction theory in the past twenty-five years." *SOCIOLOGICAL QUARTERLY*, 5:61-84.
- Kuhn, T. 1962. *STRUCTURE OF SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langer, S. K. 1951. *PHILOSOPHY IN A NEW KEY: A STUDY IN THE SYMBOLISM OR REASON, RITE, AND ART*. 2d ed. New York: New American Library.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1953. *FEELING AND FORM: A THEORY OF ART*. New York: Scribner.
- Larsen, O. N. 1964. "Social effects of mass communication." In R. Merton (ed.) *HANDBOOK OF MODERN SOCIOLOGY*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., B. Berelson, and H. Gaudet. 1965. *THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE*. 2d ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Lazarsfeld, P. F., and M. Rosenberg (eds.) 1955. THE LANGUAGE OF SOCIAL RESEARCH: A READER IN THE METHODOLOGY OF SOCIAL RESEARCH. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., A. K. Pasanella, and M. Rosenberg. 1972. CONTINUITIES IN THE LANGUAGE OF SOCIAL RESEARCH. New York: Free Press.
- Lefkowitz, M. M., L. E. Eron, L. O. Walder, and L. R. Huesmann. 1971. "Television violence and child aggression: A follow-up study." In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (eds.) TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR, 3:35-135. Washington: USGPO.
- Lieberman, B. (ed.) 1971. CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS IN STATISTICS: A BOOK OF READINGS FOR THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Liebert, R. M. 1971. "Television and Social Learning." Overview of J. Murray, G. A. Comstock, and E. A. Rubinstein (eds.) TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR. Vol. 2. Washington: USGPO.
- Light, R. J. 1973. "Issues in the analysis of qualitative data." In R. M. W. Travers (ed.) SECOND HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON TEACHING. Chicago: Rand McNally, p. 318-81.
- Lotz, P. H. (ed.) 1931. STUDIES IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. Nashville: Cokesbury.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) 1950. ORIENTATION IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. New York: Abingdon Press.
- Lowman, J. 1973. "Development and evaluation of a pre-marital education program." PROCEEDINGS OF THE 81ST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, Montreal, 1973, 8:985-86.
- Lumsdaine, A. A., and M. A. May. 1965. "Mass communication and educational media." ANNUAL REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY, 1965, 16:475-534. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Lynn, R. W., and E. Wright. 1971. BIG LITTLE SCHOOL: TWO HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL. New York: Harper & Row.
- McCall, G. J., and J. L. Simmons, 1966. IDENTITIES AND INTERACTIONS. New York: Free Press.
- McGuire, W. J. 1966. "Attitudes and opinions." ANNUAL REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY, 17:475-514. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1969. "The nature of attitudes and attitude change." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.) THE HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 2d ed. 3:136-314. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. "The yin and yang of progress in social psychology: Seven koan." JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 26: 446-56.

- McLeod, J. M. 1971. "Issues and strategies in co-orientation research." Presented to Association for Education in Journalism. Columbia, S. C.
- \_\_\_\_\_, C. K. Atkin, and S. H. Chaffee. 1971. "Adolescents, parents, and television use: Self-report and other-report measures from the Wisconsin sample." In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (eds.) TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR, 3:239-313. Washington: USGPO.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and G. J. O'Keefe, Jr. 1972. "The socialization perspective and communication behavior." In F. G. Kline and P. J. Tichenor (eds.) CURRENT PERSPECTIVES IN MASS COMMUNICATION RESEARCH, 1:121-68. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McQuail, D. 1969. TOWARDS A SOCIOLOGY OF MASS COMMUNICATION. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Maccoby, E. E. 1964. "Effects of the mass media." In M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman (eds.) REVIEW OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Madge, J. 1953. THE TOOLS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE. Garden City, NY: Doubleday. (Originally published by Longmans, Green.)
- Manis, J. G., and B. N. Meltzer (eds.) 1967. SYMBOLIC INTERACTION: A READER IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Martindale, D. 1960. THE NATURE AND TYPES OF SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Mead, G. H. 1934. MIND, SELF, SOCIETY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1938. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ACT. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. ON SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY: SELECTED PAPERS. Edited and with an introduction by A. Strauss. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meland, B. (ed.) 1969. THE FUTURE OF EMPIRICAL THEOLOGY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meltzer, B. N., and J. W. Petras. 1970. "The Chicago and Iowa schools of symbolic interactionism." In T. Shibutani (ed.) HUMAN NATURE AND COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR: PAPERS IN HONOR OF HERBERT BLUMER. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Menchan, W. M. 1969. INTRODUCTION TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND PARENT EDUCATION. Rev. ed. New York: Vantage Press.
- Mendelsohn, H. 1964. "Sociological perspectives on the study of mass communication." In L. A. Dexter and D. M. White (eds.) PEOPLE, SOCIETY AND MASS COMMUNICATION. New York: Free Press.



- Merton, R. K. 1968. SOCIAL THEORY AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE. Enlarged ed. New York: Free Press.
- Moore, A. J. 1970. "The place of scientific models and theological reflection in the practice of ministry." Lecture given January 22, 1970, as part of the faculty lecture series on "The Church in the 1970's" in honor of the inauguration of Gordon E. Michalson as the second president of the School of Theology at Claremont, California. Mimeographed.
- Morgan, J., and J. Sonquist. 1963. "Problems in the analysis of survey data." JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION, 58:415-34.
- Morrison, D. E., and R. E. Henkel. 1970. THE SIGNIFICANCE TEST CONTROVERSY. Chicago: Aldine.
- Morrison, D. F. 1967. MULTIVARIATE STATISTICAL METHODS. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Moser, C. A., and G. Kalton. 1972. SURVEY METHODS IN SOCIAL INVESTIGATION. 2d American ed. New York: Basic Books.
- Mosteller, F., and J. W. Tukey. 1968. "Data analysis, including statistics." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.) HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. 2d ed. 2:80-203. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Murphy, L. B. 1956. "Effects of childrearing patterns on mental health." CHILDREN, 3:213-8.
- Newcomb, T. M. 1953. "An approach to the study of communicative acts." PSYCHOLOGICAL REVIEW, 60: 393-404.
- Nie, N. H., D. H. Bent, and C. H. Hull. 1970. STATISTICAL PACKAGE FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nye, F. I. 1964. "Field research." In H. T. Christensen (ed.) HANDBOOK OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY. Chicago: Rand McNally, p. 247-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and A. E. Bayer. 1963. "Some recent trends in family research." SOCIAL FORCES, 41:290-301.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and F. M. Berardo (eds.) 1966. EMERGING CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS IN FAMILY ANALYSIS. New York: Macmillan.
- Okabe, K. 1963. "Broadcasting research in post-war Japan." In A. Katagiri and K. Motono (eds.) STUDIES OF BROADCASTING. Radio and Television Culture Research Institute, Japan Broadcasting Corp., p. 7-47.
- Park, R. E., and E. W. Burgess. 1924. INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF SOCIOLOGY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Peterson, J. A. 1964. EDUCATION FOR MARRIAGE, 2d ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Pittenger, N. 1969. "Process theology." In A. Richardson (ed.) A DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Platt, J. W. 1964. "Strong inference." SCIENCE, 146(5642):347-53.
- Press, L. I., M. S. Rogers, and G. H. Shure. 1969. "An interactive technique for the analysis of multivariate data." BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE, 14:364-70.
- Pruzek, R. M. 1971. "Methods and problems in the analysis of multivariate data." REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, 41:163-90.
- Rausch, H. L. 1970. "Relations at three early stages of marriage as reflected by the use of personal pronouns." FAMILY PROCESS, 9:69-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_, W. Goodrich, and J. D. Campbell. 1963. "Adaptation to the first years of marriage." PSYCHIATRY, 26:368-80.
- REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY. 1970. New York: Bantam.
- Riley, J. W., Jr. 1962. "Reflections on data sources in opinion research." PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 26:313-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and M. W. Riley. 1959. "Mass communication and the social system." In R. K. Merton, L. Broom, and L. S. Cottrell, Jr. (eds.) SOCIOLOGY TODAY. New York: Basic Books, p. 537-78
- Rodgers, R. H. 1973. FAMILY INTERACTION AND TRANSACTION: THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Rogers, E. M., and F. F. Shoemaker. 1971. COMMUNICATION OF INNOVATIONS. New York: Free Press.
- Rose, A. M. 1962. HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL PROCESSES: AN INTERACTIONAL APPROACH. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rosenberg, M. 1968. THE LOGIC OF SURVEY ANALYSIS. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosenthal, R. 1966. EXPERIMENTER EFFECTS IN BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Rossi, A. S. 1968. "Transition into parenthood." JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY, 30:26-39.
- Ruano, B. J., J. D. Bruce, and M. M. McDermott. 1969. "Pilgrim's Progress II: Recent trends and prospects in family research." JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY, 31:688-98.

- Ruesch, J., and G. Bateson. 1968. COMMUNICATION: THE SOCIAL MATRIX OF PSYCHIATRY. 2d ed. New York: Norton.
- Rubinstein, E. A., G. A. Comstock, and J. P. Murray (eds.) 1971. TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR: A TECHNICAL REPORT TO THE SURGEON GENERAL'S SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR. Washington: USGPO.
- Ryder, R. G. 1967. "Compatibility in marriage." PSYCHOLOGICAL REPORTS, 20:807-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. "Separating and joining influences in courtship and early marriage." AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ORTHOPSYCHIATRY, 41:450-64.
- Schramm, W. 1962. "Mass communication." ANNUAL REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY, 1962, 13:251-84. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) 1964. THE EFFECTS OF TELEVISION ON CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS. An annotated bibliography with an introductory overview of research results. Prepared by International Association for Mass Communication Research. UNESCO Reports and Papers on Mass Communication, No. 43.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and M. Roberts. 1971. THE EFFECTS OF MASS COMMUNICATION. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, J. Lyle, and E. B. Parker. 1961. TELEVISION IN THE LIVES OF OUR CHILDREN. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, J. Lyle, and I. deS. Pool. 1963. THE PEOPLE LOOK AT EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Schvaneveldt, J. D. 1966. "The interactional framework in the study of the family." In F. I. Nye and F. M. Berardo (eds.) EMERGING CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS IN FAMILY ANALYSIS. New York: Macmillan, p. 97-129.
- Selltiz, C., M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S. W. Cook. 1959. RESEARCH METHODS IN SOCIAL RELATIONS. Rev. ed. New York: Holt.
- Selvin, H. C. 1957. "A critique of tests of significance in survey analysis." AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 22:519-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1968. "Survey analysis: Methods of survey analysis." In ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, 15:411-19. New York: Macmillan and Free Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and A. Stuart. 1966. "Data-dredging procedures in survey analysis." AMERICAN STATISTICIAN, 20:20-3.
- Sewell, W. H. 1963. "Some recent developments in socialization theory and research." ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, 349:163-81. Reprinted in J. R. Eshleman (ed.) PERSPECTIVES IN MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, p. 567-91.

- Sherill, L. J. 1951. THE STRUGGLE OF THE SOUL. New York: Macmillan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1955. THE GIFT OF POWER. New York: Macmillan.
- Siegel, S. 1956. NONPARAMETRIC STATISTICS FOR THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Simon, H. A. 1957. MODELS OF MAN. New York: Wiley.
- Simon, J. L. 1969. BASIC RESEARCH METHODS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE: THE ART OF EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION. New York: Random House.
- Smith, H. S. 1941. FAITH AND NURTURE. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Snyder, R. 1950. "Experimentation and Research." In P. H. Lotz (ed.) ORIENTATION IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. Nashville: Abingdon Press, p. 404-15.
- Stein, A. H., and L. K. Friedrich. 1972. "Television content and young children's behavior." In J. P. Murray, E. A. Rubinstein, and G. A. Comstock (eds.) TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR. VOL. II: TELEVISION AND SOCIAL LEARNING. Washington: USGPO.
- Steiner, G. 1963. THE PEOPLE LOOK AT TELEVISION. New York: Knopf.
- Stendenbach, F. J. 1966. "Learning and behavior: A trend report and bibliography. 1967." CURRENT SOCIOLOGY, 14(3).
- Stephenson, W. 1967. THE PLAY THEORY OF MASS COMMUNICATION. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stone, G. P., and H. A. Farberman. 1970. SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY THROUGH SYMBOLIC INTERACTION. Waltham, MA: Ginn Blaisdell.
- Strauss, A. (ed.) 1964. (See Mead, 1964.)
- Stryker, S. 1956. "Relationship of married offspring and parents: A test of Mead's theory." AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, 52:308-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1959. "Symbolic Interaction as an approach to family research." MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIVING, 21:111-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. "The interactional and situational approaches." In H. T. Christensen (ed.) HANDBOOK OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY. Chicago: Rand McNally, p. 125-70.
- Tannenbaum, P. H., and B. S. Greenberg. 1968. "Mass communication." ANNUAL REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY, 19:351-86. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Tatsuoka, M. M. 1971. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS: TECHNIQUES FOR EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH. New York: Wiley.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. "Multivariate analysis in educational research."  
In F. N. Kerlinger (ed.) REVIEW OF RESEARCH IN EDUCATION.  
Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and D. V. Tiedeman. 1963. "Statistics as an aspect of scientific method in research on teaching." In N. L. Gage (ed.) HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON TEACHING. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Taylor, J. J. (ed.) 1960. AN INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.  
Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) 1966. AN INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.  
Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR. 1971. (See Rubinstein, et al.)
- Thomas, W. I., and F. Znaniecki. 1918-20. THE POLISH PEASANT IN EUROPE AND AMERICA. Boston: Badger.
- Troldahl, V., and D. E. Costello. 1966. "Media exposure patterns and interpersonal communication behavior of teenagers." Presented to Association for Education in Journalism, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Tukey, J. W. 1960. "Conclusions vs. decisions." TECHNOMETRICS, 2:423-33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. "The future of data analysis." ANNALS OF MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS, 33:1-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1969. "Analyzing data: Sanctification or detective work?" AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST, 24:83-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. EXPLORATORY DATA ANALYSIS. Limited Preliminary Edition. Vol. 1. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and M. B. Wilk. 1966. "Data analysis and statistics: An expository overview." AFIPR CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS, p. 695-709.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. "Data analysis and statistics: Techniques and approaches." In E. R. Tufte (ed.) THE QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Udry, J. R. 1968. "Sex and family life." In E. Sagarin (ed.) SEX AND THE CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN SCENE. ANNALS, 376:25-35.
- UNESCO. 1961. INFLUENCE OF THE CINEMA ON CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS. UNESCO Reports and Papers on Mass Communication, No. 31.
- UNESCO. 1964. (See Schramm (ed.) 1964.)
- Verplanck, W. S. 1970. "An 'overstatement' on psychological research: What is a dissertation?" PSYCHOLOGICAL RECORD, 20:119-22.

- Waller, W. 1934. "Insight and scientific method." AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, 40:285-97. Reprinted in W. J. Goode, F. F. Furstenberg, Jr., and L. Mitchell (eds.) ON THE FAMILY, EDUCATION, AND WAR: SELECTED WRITINGS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Watson, G. 1931. "Research in religious education." In P. H. Lotz (ed.) STUDIES IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, p. 150-74.
- Watzlawick, P., J. H. Beavin, and D. D. Jackson. 1967. PRAGMATICS OF HUMAN COMMUNICATION: A STUDY OF INTERACTIONAL PATTERNS, PATHOLOGIES, AND PARADOXES. New York: Norton.
- Weiss, W. 1969. "Effects of the mass media of communication." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.) THE HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 2d ed. 5:77-195. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. "Mass communication." ANNUAL REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY, 1971. 22:309-336. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Whitehead, A. N. 1926. SCIENCE AND THE MODERN WORLD. New York: Macmillan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1929. PROCESS AND REALITY: AN ESSAY IN COSMOLOGY. New York: Free Press. (Paper ed., 1969.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1933. ADVENTURES OF IDEAS. New York: Macmillan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1938. MODES OF THOUGHT. New York: Macmillan.
- Whiting, B. B. (ed.) 1963. SIX CULTURES: STUDIES OF CHILD REARING. New York: Wiley.
- Williams, D. D. 1968. THE SPIRIT AND THE FORMS OF LOVE. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wright, C., and H. Turk. 1967. "Introductory comments on the socialization of adults." SOCIOLOGICAL INQUIRY, 37:3-10.
- Wright, C. R. 1959. MASS COMMUNICATION. New York: Random House.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1960. "Functional analysis and mass communication." PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 24:605-20.
- Wycoff, D. C. 1966. "Research and evaluation in Christian education." In M. J. Taylor (ed.) AN INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. Nashville: Abingdon Press, p. 144-56.
- Wynn, J. C. (ed.) 1966. SEX, FAMILY, AND SOCIETY IN THEOLOGICAL FOCUS. New York: Association Press.
- Yorburg, B. 1973. THE CHANGING FAMILY. New York: Columbia University Press.

Zigler, E. F., and I. L. Child. 1969. "Socialization." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.) THE HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. 2d ed. 3:450-589. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1973. SOCIALIZATION AND PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT.  
Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

## A P P E N D I C E S



APPENDIX A

Marital Style Inventory

c 1971

The School of Theology at Claremont  
Young Adult Marriage Project

Allen J. Moore, Ph.D., Director  
Arlo D. Compaan, B.D., Associate Director

## School of Theology at Claremont

## MARITAL STYLE INVENTORY

c 1971

Directions:

1. There are no right or wrong answers. Answer each question according to how you feel--not how your spouse or others might feel or think.
2. Record your initial responses. Mark the blanks with an "X," circle the code number which corresponds to your chosen answer, or write in the appropriate number.

Examples: 1. How long have you been married?  
               ~~X~~ 1) Three years or less  
               2) More than three years

2. Indicate whether you strongly agree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements by circling the corresponding code number:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Strongly Disagree

A. Love is an overpowering feeling . . . . 1 2  
 B. Love and marriage go together . . . . . 1 2

3. Two questions call for a brief written response. Write out what most appropriately describes your feelings and ideas.
4. Spouse means your present husband or wife.
5. When you have completed the questionnaire, we ask you to mail separately the enclosed response post-card with your name and address, so that we can scientifically complete our sample while maintaining the anonymity of the questionnaire.
6. When finished, enclose the questionnaires in the self-addressed stamped envelope and mail.
7. Thank you for your cooperation and we hope you find the questionnaire completion an enjoyable experience.

Allen Moore, Ph.D.  
 Director Young Adult Marriage Project and  
 Professor of Religion and Personality and Education

Arlo Compaan, B.D.  
 Associate Director Young Adult Marriage Project and  
 Faculty Assistant in Religion and Personality

With each of the following statements, indicate whether you very strongly agree, strongly agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree, strongly disagree or very strongly disagree by circling the corresponding code number.

|                                                                                                  | Very Strongly<br>Agree | Strongly<br>Agree | Mildly<br>Agree | Mildly<br>Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree | Very Strongly<br>Disagree |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Very Strongly Agree                                                                           |                        |                   |                 |                    |                      |                           |
| 2. Strongly Agree                                                                                |                        |                   |                 |                    |                      |                           |
| 3. Mildly Agree                                                                                  |                        |                   |                 |                    |                      |                           |
| 4. Mildly Disagree                                                                               |                        |                   |                 |                    |                      |                           |
| 5. Strongly Disagree                                                                             |                        |                   |                 |                    |                      |                           |
| 6. Very Strongly Disagree                                                                        |                        |                   |                 |                    |                      |                           |
| 1. Being a good husband or wife is more important than being a good father or mother . . . . .   | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 2. Communication is more open in our marriage than it was in my parent's. . . . .                | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 3. We usually discuss the movies we see in relationship to our own life and experience . . . . . | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 4. The sexual relationship is the most significant part of a marriage . . . . .                  | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 5. Improving our sexual relationship is a primary goal in our marriage . . . . .                 | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 6. Natural childbirth is a more rewarding method of childbirth . . . . .                         | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 7. Sexual expression is basically a procreative act . . . . .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 8. Making your fun is superior to buying it . . . . .                                            | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 9. I prefer to be with my spouse, rather than my very good friends or family. . . . .            | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 10. Contemporary movies have been an education for our own marriage . . . . .                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 11. The relatives I associate with are those who think and live like I do . . . . .              | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 12. Raising the children properly is the biggest task in marriage . . . . .                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 13. The population crisis is an important factor in my decision regarding family size . . . . .  | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |

-2-

|                                                                                                                   | Very Strongly<br>Agree | Strongly<br>Agree | Mildly<br>Agree | Mildly<br>Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree | Very Strongly<br>Disagree |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 14. Changing ones career or occupation is to be expected in our rapidly changing society . . . . .                | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 15. Advancement opportunities are as important as personal satisfaction in choosing a job or occupation . . . . . | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 16. I feel that my spouse does talk freely with me about his/her most intimate thoughts and feelings . . . . .    | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 17. Of first importance in marriage is the husband-wife relationship . . . . .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 18. Sex is most difficult to talk about. . . . .                                                                  | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 19. People who think too much about sex are immature . . . . .                                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 20. Sexual intercourse is a sacred act. . . . .                                                                   | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 21. Breast feeding a baby is better than bottle feeding . . . . .                                                 | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 22. We choose commercialized entertainment before self-made recreation. . . . .                                   | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 23. Social and recreational activities are a big budget item for us. . . . .                                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 24. We go out more often as a couple than my parents did . . . . .                                                | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 25. Most of my friends have the same life-style (way of life) I do . . . . .                                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 26. One should visit the relatives, even though it isn't always enjoyable. . . . .                                | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 27. Two children is just the right number for a happy family . . . . .                                            | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 28. A wife can earn more than her husband and not cause irreparable damage. . . . .                               | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 29. Pay and prestige are very important considerations in taking a job. . . . .                                   | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 30. I see several career possibilities in my future. . . . .                                                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 31. New forms of marriage are required today . . . . .                                                            | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |

-3-

|                                                                                                                            | Very Strongly<br>Agree | Strongly<br>Agree | Mildly<br>Agree | Mildly<br>Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree | Very Strongly<br>Disagree |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 32. Expressing anger is as important as<br>expressing love in marriage . . . . .                                           | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 33. Personal growth and change is<br>essential in marriage . . . . .                                                       | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 34. Marriage is a love relationship that<br>does not require a legal contract . . . . .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 35. Marriage does not require a wedding. . . . .                                                                           | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 36. Apartment style living has distinct<br>advantages over living in a house. . . . .                                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 37. Settling down in one place is not<br>very important. . . . .                                                           | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 38. Religion is an important part of<br>our way of living . . . . .                                                        | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 39. I feel that I can talk freely with my<br>spouse about my most intimate<br>thoughts and feelings . . . . .              | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 40. Playing together is an important<br>in sex as reaching a climax . . . . .                                              | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 41. Sex, like food, is more enjoyable<br>when you have variety with your<br>spouse . . . . .                               | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 42. Sexual communication is the<br>deepest and most important communi-<br>cation between spouses. . . . .                  | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 43. My parents are closer to me than<br>friends my own age. . . . .                                                        | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 44. I look forward to a few years with<br>my spouse after the children are<br>out of the home . . . . .                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 45. Both husband and wife should<br>contribute to the family income. . . . .                                               | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 46. In the choice of a job, the emotional<br>consequences to me and my family are<br>more important than the pay . . . . . | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 47. A five year renewable contract<br>would be a possible base for a<br>marriage . . . . .                                 | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 48. The primary function of marriage is<br>to increase my personal fulfillment. . . . .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |

-4-

|                                                                                                         | Very Strongly<br>Agree | Strongly<br>Agree | Mildly<br>Agree | Mildly<br>Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree | Very Strongly<br>Disagree |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 49. Raising a family is the basic focus of marriage . . . . .                                           | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 50. Young adults today are more concerned with their marriage than the older generation . . . . .       | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 51. Divorce sometime in one's life is to be expected today . . . . .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 52. The standard of living we have is virtually the same as my parents had. . . . .                     | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 53. My spouse is the first to know about the painful experiences I have . . . . .                       | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 54. Sex is primarily fun . . . . .                                                                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 55. A couple ought to be free to experiment sexually in their marriage . . . . .                        | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 56. Sexual foreplay is more enjoyable than is the climax . . . . .                                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 57. I hope to continually make intercourse more enjoyable . . . . .                                     | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 58. My parents occupy a very significant place in my way of life now . . . . .                          | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 59. Adoption of children should be considered after one has two children. . . . .                       | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 60. Marriage is first of all a legal contract . . . . .                                                 | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 61. Marriage is only valid as long as it meets the needs of both spouses. . . . .                       | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 62. Marriage, at least the first one, can be a trial relationship in which to mature a little . . . . . | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 63. A woman should have as much freedom in a marriage as a man . . . . .                                | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 64. Communication is the basis of a marriage . . . . .                                                  | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 65. Owning your home is to be preferred to renting . . . . .                                            | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |
| 66. Living together before marriage is an important way to find out if marriage will work . . . . .     | 1                      | 2                 | 3               | 4                  | 5                    | 6                         |

-5-

67. How much of your weekly budget would you estimate is spent on social and recreational activities?

- |                                           |                                    |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) 14% and above | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) 6 - 8% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) 12 - 13%      | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) 3 - 5% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) 9 - 11%       | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) 0 - 2% |

68. In the last month how many times have you gone out with just your spouse?

- |                                                 |                                        |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) More than six times | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Twice      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) 4 - 6 times         | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Once       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) 3 times             | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Not at all |

69. How many magazine articles on sex and marriage have you read in the last six months?

- |                                       |                                  |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) 9 or more | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Two  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) 6 - 8     | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) One  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) 3 - 5     | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) None |

70. How many times have you and your spouse attended a movie theater in the last three months?

- |                                               |                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) More than 8 times | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Twice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) 6 - 8 times       | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Once  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) 3 - 5 times       | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) None  |

71. How many books on sex and marriage have you read in the last six months?

- |                                  |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) None | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) 3 - 5     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) One  | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) 6 - 8     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Two  | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) 9 or more |

72. How many children do you want (by birth and/or adoption)?

- |                                  |                                          |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) None | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Three        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) One  | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Four         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Two  | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Five or more |

73. How old were you when you decided on your career or occupation?

- |                                          |                                     |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) 31 and above | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) 19 - 21 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) 28 - 30      | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) 16 - 18 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) 25 - 27      | <input type="checkbox"/> 7) 0 - 15  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4) 22 - 24      |                                     |

74. How frequently do you and your spouse visit another couple socially?

- |                                                  |                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Twice a week or more | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Once a month         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Weekly               | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Several times a year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Every other week     | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Once a year          |

-6-

Thinking of marriage, how important do you consider each of the following items? Indicate by circling the appropriate code number.

|                                                                               | Extremely<br>Important | Very<br>Important | Moderately<br>Important | Slightly<br>Important | Very Slightly<br>Important | Not Important<br>At All |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Extremely Important                                                        |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| 2. Very Important                                                             |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| 3. Moderately Important                                                       |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| 4. Slightly Important                                                         |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| 5. Very slightly Important                                                    |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| 6. Not Important At All                                                       |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| 75. My spouse's helping me to grow . . . .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 76. Spending my free time with my spouse .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 77. Having a comfortable house . . . . .                                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 78. Adequate savings and investment. . . .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 79. Sexual playing together. . . . .                                          | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 80. Traveling and seeing new, interesting<br>places and things . . . . .      | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 81. The wife's being a good cook and<br>housekeeper . . . . .                 | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 82. Being free and independent from your<br>parents . . . . .                 | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 83. Being able to give a good education<br>to my children. . . . .            | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 84. The chance to have children. . . . .                                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 85. The wife's having a career . . . . .                                      | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 86. The husband's holding a steady,<br>well-paying job . . . . .              | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 87. The kind of house, car and clothes . .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 88. Having labor saving appliances . . . .                                    | 1                      | 2                 | 3                       | 4                     | 5                          | 6                       |
| 89. How frequently do you alone spend some time with a friend?                |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 1) Twice a week or more                                                 |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 2) Weekly                                                               |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 3) Every other week                                                     |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 4) Once a month                                                         |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 5) Several times a year                                                 |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 6) Once a year                                                          |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| 90. How much time do you usually spend each week talking with your<br>spouse? |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 1) 3 hours or less                                                      |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 2) 6 hours                                                              |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 3) 9 hours                                                              |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 4) 12 hours                                                             |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 5) 15 hours                                                             |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |
| _____ 6) 18 hours or more                                                     |                        |                   |                         |                       |                            |                         |



-7-

91. Would you describe your relationship with your parents as

- |                                                        |                                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Estranged                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Fair            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Strained                   | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Close           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Cool                       | <input type="checkbox"/> 7) Unusually close |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Separated but not negative |                                             |

92. Would you describe your relationship with your spouse's parents as:

- |                                                        |                                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Estranged                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Fair            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Strained                   | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Close           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Cool                       | <input type="checkbox"/> 7) Unusually Close |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Separated but not negative |                                             |

93. How many face to face contacts do you have with your parents?

- |                                                         |                                                      |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Four times per year or less | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) One per week             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Once per month              | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Three per week           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Twice per month             | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) More than three per week |

94. How many contacts by letter or phone do you have with your parents?

- |                                                         |                                                      |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Four times per year or less | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) One per week             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Once per month              | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Three per week           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Twice per month             | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) More than three per week |

95. Have you, after being married received financial support from one or both of your parents?

- |                                 |                                |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> 2) No |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|

96. During the last few months how often have you had intercourse?

- |                                                 |                                                    |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Daily or oftener    | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Once or twice a week   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) 5 times a week      | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Once or twice a month  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) 3 or 4 times a week | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Less than once a month |

97. On the average how much time do you spend in sexual activity, including all sexually stimulating activities immediately prior to and following intercourse?

- |                                             |                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) 0 to 20 minutes | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) One hour            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) 30 minutes      | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Two hours           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) 45 minutes      | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) More than two hours |

98. What has been the longest time that you have spent in sexual activity?

- |                                                    |                                               |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) 30 minutes or less     | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) 1-1/2 to 2 hours  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) 30 minutes to one hour | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) 2 to 3 hours      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) 1 to 1-1/2 hours       | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) More than 3 hours |

-8-

99. How often in the last month have you talked openly with your spouse about your sexual relationship and its meaning for you?

- |                                         |                                             |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Not at all  | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) 5 - 6 times     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) 1 - 2 times | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) 7 - 8 times     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) 3 - 4 times | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) 9 or more times |

Indicate by circling the extent to which you and your spouse have discussed the following subjects. Circle the appropriate number. "1" indicates extensive discussion and "6" indicates no discussion.

- |                                                                    | <u>extensive</u> |   |   |   |   | <u>no</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
|                                                                    | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 100. Doubts and hopes for life . . . . .                           | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 101. Dislikes about your parent's marital relationship. . . . .    | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 102. Dreams you have had . . . . .                                 | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 103. Difficult experiences in childhood. . . . .                   | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 104. Dissatisfactions with your relationship. . . . .              | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 105. Political issues. . . . .                                     | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 106. Religious doubts and beliefs. . . . .                         | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 107. Sexual fantasies. . . . .                                     | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 108. Your sexual desires and expressions with your spouse. . . . . | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 109. When to have children . . . . .                               | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 110. How to raise your children. . . . .                           | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 111. Experiences at work . . . . .                                 | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 112. The meaning of marriage . . . . .                             | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 113. How money is spent on leisure activities. . . . .             | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 114. The kind of furniture to get. . . . .                         | 1                | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |
| 115. What is your present rent or house payment?                   |                  |   |   |   |   |           |

- |                                          |                                             |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Below \$100  | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) \$200 to 249    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) \$100 to 149 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) \$250 to 349    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) \$150 to 199 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) \$350 and above |

-9-

116. What is the present evaluation of your car?

- |                                              |                                               |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) \$0 to 999       | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) \$3,000 to 3,999  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) \$1,000 to 1,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) \$4,000 to 4,999  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) \$2,000 to 2,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) \$5,000 and above |

117. Our standard of living is

- |                                                   |                                           |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Mid high to High high | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Middle middle |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Low high              | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Low middle    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) High middle           | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Low           |

118. Do you consider yourself to be

- |                                                   |                                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Very highly religious | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Slightly religious      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Highly religious      | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Very slightly religious |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Moderately religious  | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Not at all religious    |

Indicate the degree of interest you have in each of the following activities by circling the appropriate code number.

|                                          |   | Very highly<br>Interested | Highly<br>Interested | Moderately<br>Interested | Slightly<br>Interested | Very slightly<br>Interested | Not at all<br>Interested |
|------------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Very highly interested                |   |                           |                      |                          |                        |                             |                          |
| 2. Highly interested                     |   |                           |                      |                          |                        |                             |                          |
| 3. Moderately interested                 |   |                           |                      |                          |                        |                             |                          |
| 4. Slightly interested                   |   |                           |                      |                          |                        |                             |                          |
| 5. Very slightly interested              |   |                           |                      |                          |                        |                             |                          |
| 6. Not at all interested                 |   |                           |                      |                          |                        |                             |                          |
| 119. Reading . . . . .                   | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 120. Hobbies . . . . .                   | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 121. Business or professional meetings . | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 122. Watching television . . . . .       | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 123. Going to a night club . . . . .     | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 124. Personal growth groups . . . . .    | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 125. Civic activities. . . . .           | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 126. Being with a few friends. . . . .   | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 127. Painting. . . . .                   | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 128. Artistic or creative expression . . | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 129. Do-it-yourself things . . . . .     | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |
| 130. Attending a church service. . . . . | 1 | 2                         | 3                    | 4                        | 5                      | 6                           |                          |

-10-

|                                                                                 | Very highly<br>interested | Highly<br>interested | Moderately<br>interested | Slightly<br>interested | Very slightly<br>interested | Not at all<br>interested |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 131. Attending a church-sponsored<br>meeting . . . . .                          | 1                         | 2                    | 3                        | 4                      | 5                           | 6                        |
| 132. Dining out with your spouse . . . . .                                      | 1                         | 2                    | 3                        | 4                      | 5                           | 6                        |
| 133. Talk sessions with spouse aimed<br>at improving your relationship. . . . . | 1                         | 2                    | 3                        | 4                      | 5                           | 6                        |
| 134. Working on the house, car or<br>other property . . . . .                   | 1                         | 2                    | 3                        | 4                      | 5                           | 6                        |
| 135. Camping . . . . .                                                          | 1                         | 2                    | 3                        | 4                      | 5                           | 6                        |
| 136. Talking with your spouse about<br>anything or everything. . . . .          | 1                         | 2                    | 3                        | 4                      | 5                           | 6                        |

137. Complete the following sentence:

For me marriage means

138. Complete the following sentence:

Living with my mate is

-11-

For each of the topics listed below, how do you think your attitudes compare with those of most people? Circle one answer code for each topic.

|                                                             |                         | <i>Far more<br/>liberal</i> | <i>Slightly more<br/>liberal</i> | <i>About the<br/>same</i> | <i>Slightly more<br/>conservative</i> | <i>Far more<br/>conservative</i> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Far more liberal                                         |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| 2. Slightly more liberal                                    |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| 3. About the same                                           |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| 4. Slightly more conservative                               |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| 5. Far more conservative                                    |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| 139. Politics . . . . .                                     | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 140. Religion . . . . .                                     | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 141. Civil rights . . . . .                                 | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 142. Vietnam War. . . . .                                   | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 143. Divorce . . . . .                                      | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 144. Abortion . . . . .                                     | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 145. Environment (ecology). . . . .                         | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 146. Feminist Movement. . . . .                             | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 147. Drugs. . . . .                                         | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 148. Law and order. . . . .                                 | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 149. Sex . . . . .                                          | 1                       | 2                           | 3                                | 4                         | 5                                     |                                  |
| 150. Your age at your last birthday was                     |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| ___ 1) 14 to 17                                             |                         |                             |                                  |                           | ___ 5) 24 or 25                       |                                  |
| ___ 2) 18 or 19                                             |                         |                             |                                  |                           | ___ 6) 26 or 27                       |                                  |
| ___ 3) 20 or 21                                             |                         |                             |                                  |                           | ___ 7) 28 to 30                       |                                  |
| ___ 4) 22 or 23                                             |                         |                             |                                  |                           | ___ 8) 31 and older                   |                                  |
| 151. Your sex is                                            |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| ___ 1) Male                                                 |                         |                             |                                  |                           | ___ 2) Female                         |                                  |
| 152. Your occupation is _____                               |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| 153. Are you                                                |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| ___ 1) student                                              | ___ 2) in the military  | ___ 3) Neither              |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| 154. How long have you been married to your current spouse? |                         |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| ___ 1) 0 to 1 year                                          | ___ 4) 3 to 4 years     |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| ___ 2) 1 to 2 years                                         | ___ 5) 4 to 5 years     |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
| ___ 3) 2 to 3 years                                         | ___ 6) 5 to 6 years     |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |
|                                                             | ___ 7) 6 years and more |                             |                                  |                           |                                       |                                  |

-12-

155. What is your combined level of income for 1970?

- ☐ 1) Under \$7,000
- ☐ 2) \$7,000 to 8,500
- ☐ 3) \$8,500 to 10,000
- ☐ 4) \$10,000 to 11,500
- ☐ 5) \$11,500 to 13,000
- ☐ 6) \$13,000 to 14,500
- ☐ 7) \$14,500 and above

156. How much of this was the wife's income?

- ☐ 1) None
- ☐ 2) less than 1/4
- ☐ 3) 1/4 to 1/2
- ☐ 4) 1/2 to 3/4
- ☐ 5) more than 3/4

157. What is your expected level of combined income 10 years from now?

- |                                                |                                                |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Under \$10,000     | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) \$18,000 to 20,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) \$10,000 to 13,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) \$21,000 to 24,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) \$14,000 to 17,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) \$25,000 and above |

158. What is your religious preference:

- ☐ 1) Protestant  
Denomination \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 2) Roman Catholic
- ☐ 3) Episcopal
- ☐ 4) Jewish
- ☐ 5) Other. Specify \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 6) None

159. My childhood and adolescence for the most part were spent in

- ☐ 1) Large urban area (central city)
- ☐ 2) Metropolitan area (surrounding cities)
- ☐ 3) Medium city
- ☐ 4) Small town
- ☐ 5) Rural area

160. This place was in the

- ☐ 1) Pacific Southwest
- ☐ 2) Pacific Northwest
- ☐ 3) Midwest (West of the Mississippi River)
- ☐ 4) Mideast (East of the Mississippi River)
- ☐ 5) East Coast
- ☐ 6) South

-13-

161. How many children do you have?

- |                                       |                                          |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) None      | <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Two          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Expecting | <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Three        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) One       | <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Four or more |

162. How much education have you had?

- ☐ 1) Some high school
- ☐ 2) High School graduate or equivalent
- ☐ 3) Business, trade or vocational school
- ☐ 4) Some college or equivalent
- ☐ 5) College graduate or equivalent
- ☐ 6) Post-college graduate work

163. From the following list check those that definitely influenced you in your learning about and preparation for marriage.

- |                                               |                                                                 |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Books             | <input type="checkbox"/> 7) Friendships                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Magazines         | <input type="checkbox"/> 8) Premarital counseling by a minister |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Television        | <input type="checkbox"/> 9) Marriage and family course          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Relatives         | <input type="checkbox"/> 10) Living on one's own                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5) Parents           | <input type="checkbox"/> 11) Others                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6) Dating Experience | Specify _____                                                   |

164. If you had some kind of premarital counseling, which of the following descriptions would you apply to the experience? Mark as many as apply.

- ☐ 1) Helpful
- ☐ 2) Interesting but not very helpful
- ☐ 3) Enjoyed getting to know the minister
- ☐ 4) Wish it would have been more helpful
- ☐ 5) A waste of time

Remarks:

165. If you had the opportunity to be involved in some discussion on the first years of marriage with other couples your age, would you be interested?

- |                                 |                                |                                       |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> 2) No | <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Undecided |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

*Thank you for your cooperation  
Please feel free to add any comments or remarks below.*

## APPENDIX B

## RECORD DEFINITION

Code Values are as indicated in the Marital  
Style Inventory (Appendix A) unless otherwise noted.

Card 1

| <u>MSI #</u> | <u>Variable</u>       | <u>Column</u> | <u>MSI #</u> | <u>Variable</u> | <u>Column</u> |
|--------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
|              | Card No. <sup>a</sup> | 1             | 32           | XPRSANGR        | 41            |
|              | I.D. No. <sup>b</sup> | 2-4           | 33           | PRSNGROW        | 42            |
|              | Gender <sup>c</sup>   | 5             | 34           | LOVVSLEG        | 43            |
|              | (blank)               | 6-9           | 35           | NOWEDDNG        | 44            |
|              |                       |               | 36           | APARTMNT        | 45            |
| 1            | WIFEMOTH              | 10            | 37           | NOSETTLE        | 46            |
| 2            | OPENCOMM              | 11            | 38           | RELIGIMP        | 47            |
| 3            | DISCMOVI              | 12            | 39           | IINTMATE        | 48            |
| 4            | SEXMOST               | 13            | 40           | PLAYING         | 49            |
| 5            | MPROVSEX              | 14            | 41           | VARIETY         | 50            |
| 6            | NATUBRTH              | 15            | 42           | SEXCOMM         | 51            |
| 7            | PROCREAT              | 16            | 43           | PRNTCLOS        | 52            |
| 8            | MAKEFUN               | 17            | 44           | POSTKIDS        | 53            |
| 9            | PREFSPOU              | 18            | 45           | HWFAMINC        | 54            |
| 10           | MOVIESED              | 19            | 46           | EMOTIONJ        | 55            |
| 11           | RELATIVS              | 20            | 47           | FIVEYEAR        | 56            |
| 12           | RAISKIDS              | 21            | 48           | PRSNFILL        | 57            |
| 13           | POPUCRIS              | 22            | 49           | FAMFOCUS        | 58            |
| 14           | CHANGCAR              | 23            | 50           | CONCERN         | 59            |
| 15           | ADVANCEJ              | 24            | 51           | DIVORCE         | 60            |
| 16           | SINTMATE              | 25            | 52           | LIVSTAND        | 61            |
| 17           | HUSBWIFE              | 26            | 53           | FRSTTONO        | 62            |
| 18           | HARDTALK              | 27            | 54           | SEXISFUN        | 63            |
| 19           | IMMATURE              | 28            | 55           | XPERIMNT        | 64            |
| 20           | SACRDACT              | 29            | 56           | FOREPLAY        | 65            |
| 21           | BRESTFED              | 30            | 57           | MAKENJOY        | 66            |
| 22           | NTERTAIN              | 31            | 58           | PARNTSIG        | 67            |
| 23           | SOCBUDGT              | 32            | 59           | ADOPTKID        | 68            |
| 24           | GOOUTOFN              | 33            | 60           | CONTRACT        | 69            |
| 25           | LIFESTYL              | 34            | 61           | MEETNEED        | 70            |
| 26           | VISRELAT              | 35            | 62           | TRIALREL        | 71            |
| 27           | TWOCHILD              | 36            | 63           | WOMNFREE        | 72            |
| 28           | WIFEARN               | 37            | 64           | COMMBASI        | 73            |
| 29           | PRESTIGJ              | 38            | 65           | OWNHOME         | 74            |
| 30           | MANYCAR               | 39            | 66           | LIVTOGB4        | 75            |
| 31           | NEWFORMS              | 40            |              |                 |               |

<sup>a</sup> Three 80-column cards were used to record observations.

<sup>b</sup> Each couple was consecutively assigned a number (from 001 to 261) as its questionnaires were received.

<sup>c</sup> 1 = husband; 2 = wife.



## APPENDIX B (Continued)

Card 2

| <u>MSI #</u> | <u>Variable</u> | <u>Column</u> | <u>MSI #</u> | <u>Variable</u> | <u>Column</u> |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
|              | Card No.        | 1             | 89           | FRENDTIM        | 31            |
|              | I.D. No.        | 2-4           | 90           | TALKTIME        | 32            |
|              | Gender          | 5             | 91           | PRNTREL         | 33            |
|              | (blank)         | 6             | 92           | SPRNTREL        | 34            |
|              |                 |               | 93           | PRNTFACE        | 35            |
| 67           | PBUDGSOC        | 7             | 94           | PRNTPHON        | 36            |
| 68           | TIMESOUT        | 8             | 95           | PRNTSUPP        | 37            |
| 69           | MAGAZINE        | 9             | 96           | COITFREQ        | 38            |
| 70           | MOVIATND        | 10            | 97           | SEXTIME         | 39            |
| 71           | BOOKS           | 11            | 98           | MAXSXTIM        | 40            |
| 72           | KIDSWANT        | 12            | 99           | FSEXTALK        | 41            |
| 73           | CAREERAG        | 13            |              | (blank)         | 42            |
| 74           | SOCVISIT        | 14            |              |                 |               |
|              | (blank)         | 15            | 100          | DSDOUBTS        | 43            |
|              |                 |               | 101          | DSDISLIK        | 44            |
| 75           | MPHLPGRO        | 16            | 102          | DSDREAMS        | 45            |
| 76           | MPFRETIM        | 17            | 103          | DSDIFEXP        | 46            |
| 77           | MPHOUSE         | 18            | 104          | DSDISSAT        | 47            |
| 78           | MPSAVING        | 19            | 105          | DSPOLISS        | 48            |
| 79           | MPSXPLAY        | 20            | 106          | DSRELBEL        | 49            |
| 80           | MPTRAVEL        | 21            | 107          | DSSXFANT        | 50            |
| 81           | MPCOOK          | 22            | 108          | DSSXDES         | 51            |
| 82           | MPINDEPN        | 23            | 109          | DSWHNKID        | 52            |
| 83           | MPEDUCAT        | 24            | 110          | DSRASKID        | 53            |
| 84           | MPCHILDR        | 25            | 111          | DSWORKXP        | 54            |
| 85           | MPWIFCAR        | 26            | 112          | DSMARIGE        | 55            |
| 86           | MPHUSJOB        | 27            | 113          | DSLEISMN        | 56            |
| 87           | MPCARCLO        | 28            | 114          | DSFURNIT        | 57            |
| 88           | MPLABSAV        | 29            |              | (blank)         | 58            |
|              | (blank)         | 30            |              |                 |               |
|              |                 |               | 115          | RENT            | 59            |
|              |                 |               | 116          | CARVALUE        | 60            |
|              |                 |               | 117          | STANDARD        | 61            |
|              |                 |               | 118          | RELIGSTY        | 62            |

## APPENDIX B (Continued)

Card 3

| <u>MSI #</u> | <u>Variable</u> | <u>Column</u> | <u>MSI #</u>     | <u>Variable</u>       | <u>Column</u> |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
|              | Card No.        | 1             | 150              | AGE                   | 42            |
|              | I.D. No.        | 2-4           | 151              | SEX                   | 43            |
|              | Gender          | 5             |                  | (blank) <sup>a</sup>  | 44            |
|              | (blank)         | 6             |                  |                       |               |
|              |                 |               | 153              | STUDMILI              | 45            |
| 119          | NTREAD          | 7             | 154              | LNGTHMAR              | 46            |
| 120          | NTHOBBY         | 8             | 155              | INCOME                | 47            |
| 121          | NTBSNMT         | 9             | 156              | INCOMERP              | 48            |
| 122          | NTTV            | 10            | 157              | EXPINCOM              | 49            |
| 123          | NTNITCLB        | 11            | 158              | RELLABEL <sup>b</sup> | 50            |
| 124          | NTGROGRP        | 12            | 158              | RELPREF               | 51            |
| 125          | NTCIVIC         | 13            | 159              | URBNRURL              | 52            |
| 126          | NTFREINDS       | 14            | 160              | REGION                | 53            |
| 127          | NTPAINT         | 15            | 161              | NUMCHILD              | 54            |
| 128          | NTARTEXP        | 16            | 162              | EDUCATN               | 55            |
| 129          | NTDOITUR        | 17            |                  | (blank)               | 56            |
| 130          | NTCRCSE         | 18            |                  |                       |               |
| 131          | NTCRCMET        | 19            | 163 <sup>c</sup> | PRBOOKS               | 57            |
| 132          | NTDINOUT        | 20            | 163              | PRMAG                 | 58            |
| 133          | NTTLKIMP        | 21            | 163              | PRTV                  | 59            |
| 134          | NTPROPRT        | 22            | 163              | PRRELATI              | 60            |
| 135          | NTCAMP          | 23            | 163              | PRPARENT              | 61            |
| 136          | NTTALK          | 24            | 163              | PRDATING              | 62            |
|              | (blank)         | 25-29         | 163              | PRFREINDS             | 63            |
|              |                 |               | 163              | PRPASTOR              | 64            |
| 139          | ATTPOL          | 30            | 163              | PRCOURSE              | 65            |
| 140          | ATTREL          | 31            | 163              | PRLIVING              | 66            |
| 141          | ATTCIVR         | 32            | 163              | PRLIVTOG              | 67            |
| 142          | ATTVWAR         | 33            |                  |                       |               |
| 143          | ATTDIVOR        | 34            | 164 <sup>c</sup> | COHELP                | 68            |
| 144          | ATTABORT        | 35            | 164              | CONTREST              | 69            |
| 145          | ATTENVIR        | 36            | 164              | COENJOY               | 70            |
| 146          | ATTFEM          | 37            | 164              | COWISH                | 71            |
| 147          | ATTDRUGS        | 38            | 164              | COWASTE               | 72            |
| 148          | ATTLAW          | 39            |                  | (blank)               | 73            |
| 149          | ATTSEX          | 40            |                  |                       |               |
|              | (blank)         | 41            | 165              | DISCUSS               | 74            |

<sup>a</sup> MSI #152, occupation, was not coded and keypunched.

<sup>b</sup> Protestant Denominations were coded as follows: 1 = Baptist; 2 = Church of Christ; 3 = Disciples; 4 = Lutheran (LCA & ALC); 5 = Methodist; 6 = Presbyterians; 7 = UCC and Congregationalists.

<sup>c</sup> 0 = not checked; 1 = checked for these items.

## STATISTICAL MODEL

Dependent Variables

The Sexual role dimension was represented by the following 21 questions in the MSI:

attitudes--4,5,7,18,19,20,40,41,42,54,55,56,57,79,149;  
reported behaviors--96,97,98,99,107,108.

The Marital role dimension was represented by the following 14 questions in the MSI:

attitudes--31,33,34,35,47,48,51,60,61,62,63,66,143;  
reported behaviors--112.

The Companionate role dimension was represented by the following 18 questions in the MSI:

attitudes--2,9,16,32,39,44,53,64,75,76,133,136;  
reported behaviors--90,100,101,102,103,104.

The Parental role dimension was represented by the following 16 questions in the MSI:

attitudes--1,6,7,12,13,17,21,27,49,59,72,83,84,144,146;  
reported behaviors--109,110.

The Leisure role dimension was represented by the following 16 questions in the MSI:

attitudes--8,22,23,24,80,120,123,127,128,129,132,135;  
reported behaviors--67,68,74,113.

The Economic role dimension was represented by the following 23 questions in the MSI:

attitudes--14,15,28,29,30,36,37,45,46,52,65,77,78,81,85,86,87,88,  
121,134;  
reported behaviors--111,113,114.

## APPENDIX C (Cont.)

Independent Variables

Media as socialization agent was represented by the following 10 questions in the MSI:

attitudes--3,10,119,122,163 (3 items);  
reported behaviors--69,70,71.

Parents as socialization agent was represented by the following 9 questions in the MSI:

attitudes--43,58,82,91,92,163;  
reported behaviors--93,94,95.

Peers as socialization agent was represented by the following 9 questions in the MSI:

attitudes--25,43,124,126,163 (2 items), 165;  
reported behaviors--74,89.

Covariates

Demographic Data and Other Socialization Agents treated as covariates were represented by the following questions in the MSI:

relatives--11,26,163;  
religion--38,118,130,131,140,158,163,164;  
socio-economic status--115,116,117,155,156,157;  
other demographic data--150,151,153,154,159,160,161,162.

## APPENDIX D-1

## SEXUAL VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| <u>VARIABLE</u> |              |             |             |                        |     |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|-----|
| <u>No.</u>      | <u>Label</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>S.D.</u> | <u>Minimum-Maximum</u> |     |
| 4               | SEXMOST      | 3.88        | 1.24        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 5               | MPROVSEX     | 3.44        | 1.37        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 7               | PROCREAT     | 4.46        | 1.59        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 18              | HARDTALK     | 4.93        | 1.21        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 19              | IMMATURE     | 4.06        | 1.33        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 20              | SACRDACT     | 3.15        | 1.62        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 40              | PLAYING      | 1.81        | 0.82        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 41              | VARIETY      | 2.10        | 1.02        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 42              | SEXCOMM      | 3.03        | 1.29        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 54              | SEXISFUN     | 2.63        | 1.26        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 55              | XPERIMNT     | 1.67        | 0.94        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 56              | FOREPLAY     | 3.40        | 1.23        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 57              | MAKENJOY     | 1.74        | 0.85        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 79              | MPSXPLAY     | 1.94        | 0.82        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 96              | COITFREQ     | 3.43        | 1.12        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 97              | SEXTIME      | 2.43        | 1.10        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 98              | MAXSXTIM     | 3.81        | 1.55        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 99              | FSEXTALK     | 2.81        | 1.57        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 107             | DSSXFANT     | 4.39        | 1.52        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 108             | DSSXDES      | 2.77        | 1.41        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 149             | ATTSEX       | 2.54        | 1.17        | 1                      | - 5 |

## MARITAL VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| <u>VARIABLE</u> |              |             |             |                        |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <u>No.</u>      | <u>Label</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>S.D.</u> | <u>Minimum-Maximum</u> |
| 31              | NEWFORMS     | 3.85        | 1.43        | 1 - 6                  |
| 33              | PRSNGROW     | 1.57        | 0.70        | 1 - 6                  |
| 34              | LOVVSLEG     | 3.58        | 1.65        | 1 - 6                  |
| 35              | NOWEDDNG     | 3.64        | 1.64        | 1 - 6                  |
| 47              | FIVEYEAR     | 4.53        | 1.45        | 1 - 6                  |
| 48              | PRSNFILL     | 3.85        | 1.34        | 1 - 6                  |
| 51              | DIVORCE      | 4.49        | 1.25        | 1 - 6                  |
| 60              | CONTRACT     | 4.65        | 1.49        | 1 - 6                  |
| 61              | MEETNEED     | 3.21        | 1.60        | 1 - 6                  |
| 62              | TRIALREL     | 4.81        | 1.40        | 1 - 6                  |
| 63              | WOMNFREE     | 1.94        | 1.13        | 1 - 6                  |
| 66              | LIVTOGB4     | 3.82        | 1.65        | 1 - 6                  |
| 112             | DSMARIGE     | 2.94        | 1.41        | 1 - 6                  |
| 143             | ATTDIVOR     | 3.53        | 1.27        | 1 - 5                  |

## COMPANION VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| <u>VARIABLE</u> |          |       |       |                 |     |
|-----------------|----------|-------|-------|-----------------|-----|
| No.             | Item     | Mean  | S.D.  | Minimum-Maximum |     |
| 2               | OPENCOMM | 2.168 | 1.091 | 1               | - 6 |
| 9               | PREFSPOU | 1.662 | 0.788 | 1               | - 6 |
| 16              | SINTMATE | 2.196 | 1.179 | 1               | - 6 |
| 32              | XPRSANGR | 2.277 | 1.144 | 1               | - 6 |
| 39              | IINTMATE | 1.860 | 0.984 | 1               | - 6 |
| 44              | POSTKIDS | 2.000 | 1.164 | 1               | - 6 |
| 53              | FRSTTONO | 2.028 | 1.125 | 1               | - 6 |
| 64              | COMMBASI | 1.498 | 0.774 | 1               | - 6 |
| 75              | MPHLPGRO | 1.925 | 0.878 | 1               | - 6 |
| 76              | MPFRETIM | 1.806 | 0.711 | 1               | - 6 |
| 90              | TALKTIME | 4.441 | 1.562 | 1               | - 6 |
| 100             | DSDOUBTS | 2.089 | 1.175 | 1               | - 6 |
| 101             | DSDISLIK | 4.028 | 1.781 | 1               | - 6 |
| 102             | DSDREAMS | 3.128 | 1.433 | 1               | - 6 |
| 103             | DSDIFEXP | 3.391 | 1.571 | 1               | - 6 |
| 104             | DSDISSAT | 3.526 | 1.568 | 1               | - 6 |
| 133             | NTTLKIMP | 1.844 | 0.988 | 1               | - 6 |
| 136             | NTTALK   | 1.494 | 0.699 | 1               | - 6 |

## PARENTAL VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| <u>VARIABLE</u> |             |             |             |                        |     |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|-----|
| <u>No.</u>      | <u>Item</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>S.D.</u> | <u>Minimum-Maximum</u> |     |
| 1               | WIFEMOTH    | 3.21        | 1.35        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 6               | NATUBRTH    | 3.18        | 1.57        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 7               | PROCREAT    | 4.46        | 1.59        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 12              | RAISKIDS    | 3.14        | 1.24        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 13              | POPUCRIS    | 2.44        | 1.41        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 17              | HUSBWIFE    | 1.52        | 0.75        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 21              | BRESTFED    | 2.61        | 1.44        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 27              | TWOCHILD    | 3.00        | 1.43        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 49              | FAMFOCUS    | 3.60        | 1.27        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 59              | ADOPTKID    | 2.84        | 1.60        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 72              | KIDSWANT    | 3.29        | 1.03        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 83              | MPEDUCAT    | 1.65        | 0.79        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 84              | MPCHILDR    | 2.10        | 1.21        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 109             | DSWHNKID    | 2.52        | 1.58        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 110             | DSRASKID    | 2.42        | 1.44        | 1                      | - 6 |
| 144             | ATTABORT    | 2.51        | 1.40        | 1                      | - 5 |
| 146             | ATTFEM      | 3.37        | 1.20        | 1                      | - 5 |



## LEISURE VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| <u>VARIABLE</u> |          |      |      |                 |   |   |
|-----------------|----------|------|------|-----------------|---|---|
| No .            | Label    | Mean | S.D. | Minimum-Maximum |   |   |
| 8               | MAKEFUN  | 1.89 | 0.87 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 22              | NTERTAIN | 4.12 | 1.23 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 23              | SOCBUDGT | 4.11 | 1.37 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 24              | GOOUTOFN | 2.78 | 1.45 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 67              | PBUDGSOC | 4.33 | 1.41 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 68              | TIMESOUT | 3.02 | 1.72 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 74              | SOCVISIT | 3.02 | 1.28 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 80              | MPTRAVEL | 2.33 | 0.99 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 113             | DSLEISMN | 2.96 | 1.46 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 120             | NTHOBBY  | 2.75 | 1.22 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 123             | NTNITCLB | 4.53 | 1.31 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 127             | NTPAINT  | 4.73 | 1.46 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 128             | NTARTEXP | 3.13 | 1.65 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 129             | NTDOITUR | 2.53 | 1.29 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 132             | NTDINOUT | 1.83 | 0.82 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 135             | NTCAMP   | 2.49 | 1.42 | 1               | - | 6 |

## ECONOMIC VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| <u>VARIABLE</u> |          |      |      |                 |     |
|-----------------|----------|------|------|-----------------|-----|
| No .            | Label    | Mean | S.D. | Minimum-Maximum |     |
| 14              | CHANGCAR | 2.76 | 1.17 | 1               | - 6 |
| 15              | ADVANCEJ | 3.29 | 1.49 | 1               | - 6 |
| 28              | WIFEEARN | 3.03 | 1.44 | 1               | - 6 |
| 29              | PRESTIGJ | 3.63 | 1.29 | 1               | - 6 |
| 30              | MANYCAR  | 2.94 | 1.34 | 1               | - 6 |
| 36              | APARTMNT | 4.32 | 1.44 | 1               | - 6 |
| 37              | NOSETTLE | 4.20 | 1.32 | 1               | - 6 |
| 45              | HWFAMINC | 3.31 | 1.17 | 1               | - 6 |
| 46              | EMOTIONJ | 2.03 | 0.99 | 1               | - 6 |
| 52              | LIVSTAND | 4.31 | 1.30 | 1               | - 6 |
| 65              | OWNHOME  | 2.16 | 1.16 | 1               | - 6 |
| 77              | MPHOUSE  | 2.44 | 0.96 | 1               | - 6 |
| 78              | MPSAVING | 2.46 | 1.00 | 1               | - 6 |
| 81              | MPCOOK   | 2.55 | 1.06 | 1               | - 6 |
| 85              | MPWIFCAR | 3.80 | 1.49 | 1               | - 6 |
| 86              | MPHUSJOB | 1.96 | 0.96 | 1               | - 6 |
| 87              | MPCARCLO | 3.35 | 1.11 | 1               | - 6 |
| 88              | MPLABSAV | 3.56 | 1.18 | 1               | - 6 |
| 111             | DSWORKXP | 1.98 | 1.04 | 1               | - 6 |
| 113             | DSLEISMN | 2.96 | 1.46 | 1               | - 6 |
| 114             | DSFURNIT | 3.44 | 1.73 | 1               | - 6 |
| 121             | NTBSNMT  | 4.26 | 1.40 | 1               | - 6 |
| 134             | NTPROPRT | 2.40 | 1.15 | 1               | - 6 |

## MEDIA VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

VARIABLE

| <u>No.</u> | <u>Label</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>S.D.</u> | <u>Minimum-Maximum</u> |   |   |
|------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|---|---|
| 3          | DISCMOVI     | 3.50        | 1.27        | 1                      | - | 6 |
| 10         | MOVIESED     | 4.08        | 1.29        | 1                      | - | 6 |
| 69         | MAGAZINE     | 3.79        | 1.60        | 1                      | - | 6 |
| 70         | MOVIATND     | 4.03        | 1.48        | 1                      | - | 6 |
| 71         | BOOKS        | 1.89        | 1.08        | 1                      | - | 6 |
| 119        | NTREAD       | 2.41        | 1.18        | 1                      | - | 6 |
| 122        | NTTV         | 3.53        | 1.21        | 1                      | - | 6 |
| 163        | PRBOOKS      | 0.46        | 0.50        | 0                      | - | 1 |
| 163        | PRMAG        | 0.25        | 0.43        | 0                      | - | 1 |
| 163        | PRTV         | 0.11        | 0.32        | 0                      | - | 1 |

## PARENTS VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| <u>VARIABLE</u> |              |             |             |                        |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| <u>No.</u>      | <u>Label</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>S.D.</u> | <u>Minimum-Maximum</u> |
| 43              | PRNTCLOS     | 3.78        | 1.43        | 1 - 6                  |
| 58              | PARNTSIG     | 3.61        | 1.46        | 1 - 6                  |
| 82              | MPINDEPN     | 2.13        | 1.15        | 1 - 6                  |
| 91              | PRNTREL      | 5.26        | 1.42        | 1 - 7                  |
| 92              | SPRNTREL     | 5.05        | 1.41        | 1 - 7                  |
| 93              | PRNTFACE     | 2.67        | 1.54        | 1 - 6                  |
| 94              | PRNTPHON     | 3.60        | 1.47        | 1 - 6                  |
| 95              | PRNTSUPP     | 1.63        | 0.49        | 1 - 2                  |
| 163             | PRPARENT     | 0.66        | 0.48        | 0 - 1                  |

## PEERS VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| <u>VARIABLE</u> |          |      |      |                 |   |   |
|-----------------|----------|------|------|-----------------|---|---|
| No.             | Label    | Mean | S.D. | Minimum-Maximum |   |   |
| 25              | LIFESTYL | 2.94 | 1.15 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 43              | PRNTCLOS | 3.78 | 1.43 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 74              | SOCVISIT | 3.02 | 1.28 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 89              | FRENDTIM | 3.00 | 1.54 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 124             | NTGROGRP | 4.05 | 1.53 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 126             | NTFREND  | 2.26 | 1.00 | 1               | - | 6 |
| 163             | PRDATING | 0.70 | 0.46 | 0               | - | 1 |
| 163             | PRFREND  | 0.60 | 0.49 | 0               | - | 1 |
| 165             | DISCUSS  | 1.61 | 0.86 | 1               | - | 3 |

## APPENDIX D-10

## DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| <u>VARIABLE</u> |          |       |       |                 |     |
|-----------------|----------|-------|-------|-----------------|-----|
| No.             | Item     | Mean  | S.D.  | Minimum-Maximum |     |
| 115             | RENT     | 2.719 | 1.076 | 1               | - 6 |
| 116             | CARVALUE | 2.460 | 1.179 | 1               | - 6 |
| 117             | STANDARD | 3.927 | 0.906 | 1               | - 6 |
| 118             | RELIGSTY | 3.099 | 1.163 | 1               | - 6 |
| 150             | AGE      | 5.047 | 1.483 | 1               | - 8 |
| 151             | SEX      | 1.488 | 0.516 | 1               | - 2 |
| 153             | STUDMILI | 2.308 | 1.001 | 1               | - 3 |
| 154             | LNGTHMAR | 3.342 | 1.911 | 1               | - 7 |
| 155             | INCOME   | 3.650 | 2.256 | 1               | - 7 |
| 156             | INCOMEWP | 2.443 | 1.240 | 1               | - 5 |
| 157             | EXPINCOM | 3.870 | 1.654 | 1               | - 6 |
| 158             | RELLABEL | 3.045 | 2.505 | 1               | - 7 |
| 158             | RELPREF  | 1.686 | 1.581 | 1               | - 6 |
| 159             | URBNRURL | 2.524 | 1.129 | 1               | - 5 |
| 160             | REGION   | 1.802 | 1.461 | 1               | - 6 |
| 161             | NUMCHILD | 2.032 | 1.277 | 1               | - 6 |
| 162             | EDUCATN  | 4.492 | 1.265 | 1               | - 6 |

## PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR MEDIA CLASSIFIERS (n=498-506)

|            | 1                  | 2                  | 3                  | 4                  | 5                  | 6                  | 7                  | 8                 | 9                 | 10   |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|
| 1 DISCMOVI | 1.00               |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                   |                   |      |
| 2 MOVIESED | .355 <sup>a</sup>  | 1.00               |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                   |                   |      |
| 3 MAGAZINE | .158 <sup>a</sup>  | .210 <sup>a</sup>  | 1.00               |                    |                    |                    |                    |                   |                   |      |
| 4 MOVIATND | .105 <sup>b</sup>  | .179 <sup>a</sup>  | .019               | 1.00               |                    |                    |                    |                   |                   |      |
| 5 BOOKS    | -.058 <sup>b</sup> | -.156 <sup>a</sup> | -.441 <sup>a</sup> | -.046              | 1.00               |                    |                    |                   |                   |      |
| 6 NTREAD   | .113 <sup>b</sup>  | .042               | .199 <sup>a</sup>  | .011               | -.186 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00               |                    |                   |                   |      |
| 7 NTTV     | -.157 <sup>a</sup> | .031               | -.039              | .103               | .040               | -.209 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00               |                   |                   |      |
| 8 PRBOOKS  | -.027              | -.118 <sup>b</sup> | -.248 <sup>a</sup> | -.040              | .262 <sup>a</sup>  | -.176 <sup>a</sup> | .058               | 1.00              |                   |      |
| 9 PRMAG    | -.149 <sup>a</sup> | -.227 <sup>a</sup> | -.330 <sup>a</sup> | .019               | .157 <sup>a</sup>  | -.103 <sup>b</sup> | .010               | .401 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00              |      |
| 10 PRTV    | -.118 <sup>b</sup> | -.228 <sup>a</sup> | -.137 <sup>b</sup> | -.139 <sup>a</sup> | .086               | .002               | -.127 <sup>b</sup> | .284 <sup>a</sup> | .345 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00 |

## APPENDIX E-1.2

## PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR PARENT CLASSIFIERS (n=482-504)

|            | 1                  | 2                  | 3                 | 4                 | 5     | 6                 | 7                 | 8    | 9    |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|-------------------|------|------|
| 1 PRNTCLOS | 1.00               |                    |                   |                   |       |                   |                   |      |      |
| 2 PARNTSIG | .448 <sup>a</sup>  | 1.00               |                   |                   |       |                   |                   |      |      |
| 3 MPINDEPN | -.152 <sup>a</sup> | -.151 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00              |                   |       |                   |                   |      |      |
| 4 PRNTREL  | -.455 <sup>a</sup> | -.483 <sup>a</sup> | .197 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00              |       |                   |                   |      |      |
| 5 SPRNTREL | .063               | -.017              | .045              | .128 <sup>b</sup> | 1.00  |                   |                   |      |      |
| 6 PRNTFACE | -.258 <sup>a</sup> | -.293 <sup>a</sup> | .013              | .257 <sup>a</sup> | -.011 | 1.00              |                   |      |      |
| 7 PRNTPHON | -.270 <sup>a</sup> | -.396 <sup>a</sup> | .002              | .386 <sup>a</sup> | .006  | .653 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00              |      |      |
| 8 PRNTSUPP | .032               | .123 <sup>b</sup>  | -.045             | -.013             | .003  | -.047             | -.014             | 1.00 |      |
| 9 PRPARENT | -.192 <sup>a</sup> | -.219 <sup>a</sup> | .055              | .262 <sup>a</sup> | -.078 | .089              | .151 <sup>a</sup> | .012 | 1.00 |

## APPENDIX E-1.3

## PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR PEER CLASSIFIERS (n=498-506)

|            | 1                 | 2                  | 3                  | 4                 | 5                  | 6     | 7                 | 8    |
|------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------|-------------------|------|
| 1 LIFESTYL | 1.00              |                    |                    |                   |                    |       |                   |      |
| 2 SOCVISIT | .164 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00               |                    |                   |                    |       |                   |      |
| 3 FRENDTIM | .038              | .291 <sup>a</sup>  | 1.00               |                   |                    |       |                   |      |
| 4 NTGROGRP | .105 <sup>b</sup> | .061               | .146 <sup>a</sup>  | 1.00              |                    |       |                   |      |
| 5 NTFRENDS | .184 <sup>a</sup> | .264 <sup>a</sup>  | .211 <sup>a</sup>  | .298 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00               |       |                   |      |
| 6 DISCUSS  | -.007             | .012               | -.056 <sup>b</sup> | .235 <sup>a</sup> | .080               | 1.00  |                   |      |
| 7 PRDATING | -.023             | -.116 <sup>b</sup> | -.108 <sup>b</sup> | -.078             | -.143 <sup>a</sup> | -.076 | 1.00              |      |
| 8 PRFRENDS | -.092             | -.165 <sup>a</sup> | -.214 <sup>a</sup> | -.077             | -.149 <sup>a</sup> | .042  | .253 <sup>a</sup> | 1.00 |

<sup>a</sup>  $p < .001$ <sup>b</sup>  $p < .01$

## APPENDIX E-2.1

MEDIA MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR "RSET" SUB-SAMPLES,  
INDICATING "PURE" RESPONSE OR NON-RESPONSE ON QUESTION 163.<sup>a</sup>

| VARIABLE | O-PARENT<br>n=24   | O-DATING<br>n=16  | O-FRENDS<br>n=23  | GRAND<br>MEAN<br>n=506 | BOOKS<br>n=41 | MAG<br>n=15 | TV<br>n=10        |
|----------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|
| DISCMOVI | $\bar{X} = 2.50^b$ | 2.88              | 3.04              | 3.05                   | 2.90          | 2.80        | 2.90              |
|          | S.D. = 1.22        | 1.03              | 1.43              | 1.62                   | 1.18          | .78         | .74               |
| MOVIESED | 4.08               | 3.94              | 3.44 <sup>b</sup> | 4.08                   | 4.27          | 3.67        | 3.60 <sup>b</sup> |
|          | 1.32               | 1.00              | 1.27              | 1.65                   | 1.18          | 1.23        | .70               |
| MAGAZINE | 3.29               | 2.75 <sup>c</sup> | 2.78 <sup>c</sup> | 3.79                   | 3.68          | 3.40        | 3.70              |
|          | 1.30               | 1.44              | 1.48              | 2.55                   | 1.54          | 1.06        | 1.25              |
| MOVIATND | 4.50               | 4.69              | 3.70              | 4.03                   | 4.08          | 4.20        | 3.50              |
|          | 1.32               | 1.35              | 1.43              | 2.19                   | 1.44          | 1.37        | 1.43              |
| BOOKS    | 2.21               | 2.25              | 2.04              | 1.89                   | 2.08          | 1.67        | 2.40              |
|          | 1.10               | 1.44              | .93               | 1.16                   | 1.14          | .82         | 1.43              |
| NTREAD   | 2.42               | 2.50              | 1.96 <sup>b</sup> | 2.41                   | 2.34          | 2.80        | 2.60              |
|          | 1.25               | 1.27              | .88               | 1.40                   | 1.13          | 1.37        | 1.35              |
| NTTV     | 3.83               | 3.56              | 3.48              | 3.53                   | 3.71          | 3.47        | 2.30 <sup>c</sup> |
|          | 1.52               | 1.50              | 1.16              | 1.47                   | 1.15          | .99         | .82               |

<sup>a</sup> "From the following list check those that definitely influenced you in your learning about and preparation for marriage." (1 = checked; 0 = blank)

$$^b P( x < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < x ) = .90$$

$$^c P( x < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < x ) = .95$$



PARENT MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR "RSET" SUB-SAMPLES,  
INDICATING "PURE" RESPONSE OR NON-RESPONSE ON QUESTION 163.<sup>a</sup>

| VARIABLE             | 0-PARENT<br>n=24 | 0-DATING<br>n=16 | 0-FRENDS<br>n=23 | GRAND<br>MEAN<br>n=506 | BOOKS<br>n=41 | MAG<br>n=15 | TV<br>n=10 |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| OPENCOMM $\bar{X}$ = | 2.08             | 2.31             | 2.55             | 2.17                   | 2.30          | 1.73        | 2.00       |
| S.D. =               | 1.02             | .87              | 1.22             | 1.19                   | 1.07          | .88         | .82        |
| PRNTCLOS             | 3.83             | 3.94             | 3.30             | 3.78                   | 4.05          | 3.80        | 3.90       |
|                      | 1.30             | 1.00             | 1.64             | 1.43                   | 1.34          | 1.15        | 1.37       |
| PARNTSIG             | 4.26             | 3.69             | 3.61             | 3.61                   | 3.95          | 3.43        | 4.00       |
|                      | 1.10             | 1.01             | 1.62             | 1.46                   | 1.30          | 1.79        | .82        |
| MPINDEPN             | 2.54             | 2.44             | 1.91             | 2.13                   | 2.17          | 2.27        | 2.60       |
|                      | 1.02             | 1.03             | 1.00             | 1.15                   | 1.28          | 1.44        | 1.08       |
| PRNTREL              | 5.13             | 5.47             | 5.46             | 5.26                   | 5.15          | 5.00        | 5.00       |
|                      | 1.06             | .74              | 1.65             | 1.42                   | 1.27          | 1.24        | 1.83       |
| SPRNTREL             | 5.17             | 5.13             | 5.55             | 5.05                   | 4.90          | 5.36        | 5.10       |
|                      | 1.13             | 1.41             | .60              | 1.41                   | 1.23          | 1.08        | .99        |
| PRNTFACE             | 2.39             | 2.27             | 2.86             | 2.67                   | 2.68          | 2.53        | 2.60       |
|                      | 1.50             | 1.28             | 1.55             | 1.54                   | 1.36          | 1.41        | 1.17       |
| PRNTPHON             | 3.26             | 3.33             | 3.91             | 3.60                   | 3.55          | 3.27        | 3.60       |
|                      | 1.29             | 1.23             | 1.23             | 1.47                   | 1.47          | 1.22        | 1.08       |
| PRNTSUPP             | 1.67             | 1.50             | 1.52             | 1.63                   | 1.66          | 1.47        | 1.50       |
|                      | .48              | .52              | .51              | .49                    | .48           | .52         | .53        |

<sup>a</sup> "From the following list check those that definitely influenced you in your learning about and preparation for marriage." (1 = checked; 0 = blank)

## APPENDIX E-2.3

PEER MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR "RSET" SUB-SAMPLES,  
INDICATING "PURE" RESPONSE OR NON-RESPONSE ON QUESTION 163.<sup>a</sup>

| VARIABLE             | O-PARENT<br>n=24 | O-DATING<br>n=16 | O-FRENDS<br>n=23  | GRAND<br>MEAN<br>n=506 | BOOKS<br>n=41 | MAG<br>n=15       | TV<br>n=10 |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------|
| LIFESTYL $\bar{X}$ = | 2.88             | 2.81             | 3.22              | 2.94                   | 2.07          | 3.07              | 3.10       |
| S.D.=                | 1.12             | .83              | 1.48              | 1.32                   | .91           | 1.16              | .99        |
| SOCVISIT             | 3.13             | 3.50             | 3.96 <sup>c</sup> | 3.02                   | 2.98          | 3.60              | 2.90       |
|                      | 1.26             | 1.46             | .98               | 1.63                   | 1.27          | .99               | 1.10       |
| FRENDTIM             | 3.04             | 3.19             | 3.30              | 3.00                   | 3.30          | 3.80              | 3.10       |
|                      | 1.49             | 1.42             | 1.85              | 2.37                   | 1.71          | 1.66              | 1.66       |
| NTGROGRP             | 3.83             | 3.50             | 3.44              | 4.05                   | 4.20          | 4.47              | 4.80       |
|                      | 1.47             | 1.67             | 1.67              | 2.34                   | 1.57          | 1.46              | 1.69       |
| NTFRENDS             | 2.29             | 2.75             | 2.26              | 2.26                   | 2.32          | 2.47              | 2.60       |
|                      | 1.16             | 1.57             | 1.29              | 1.00                   | .93           | .99               | .97        |
| DISCUSS              | 2.00             | 1.94             | 1.35              | 1.61                   | 1.68          | 2.07 <sup>b</sup> | 1.80       |
|                      | .98              | 1.00             | .65               | .74                    | .88           | .88               | .79        |

<sup>a</sup> "From the following list check those that definitely influenced you in your learning about and preparation for marriage." (1= checked; 0= blank)

<sup>b</sup>  $P(x < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < x) = .90$

<sup>c</sup>  $P(x < \mu_1 - \mu_2 < x) = .95$

## APPENDIX E-2.4

DEMOGRAPHIC MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR "RSET" SUB-SAMPLES  
INDICATING "PURE" RESPONSE OR NON-RESPONSE ON QUESTION 163.<sup>a</sup>

| VARIABLE |             | O-PARENT<br>n=24 | O-DATING<br>n=16 | O-FRENDS<br>n=23 | GRAND<br>MEAN<br>n=506 | BOOKS<br>n=41 | MAG<br>n=15 | TV<br>n=10 |
|----------|-------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| AGE      | $\bar{X}$ = | 5.50             | 5.50             | 4.96             | 5.05                   | 5.05          | 4.27        | 4.20       |
|          | S.D. =      | 1.56             | 1.75             | 1.22             | 1.48                   | 1.38          | 1.75        | 1.32       |
| SEX      |             | 1.58             | 1.25             | 1.61             | 1.49                   | 1.37          | 1.60        | 1.50       |
|          |             | .50              | .45              | .50              | 0.52                   | .49           | .51         | .53        |
| STUDMILI |             | 2.39             | 2.31             | 2.39             | 2.31                   | 2.23          | 2.47        | 2.50       |
|          |             | .94              | .95              | .94              | 1.00                   | .96           | .92         | .85        |
| LNGTHMAR |             | 3.04             | 2.38             | 3.35             | 3.34                   | 3.32          | 3.20        | 2.30       |
|          |             | 1.85             | 1.46             | 2.21             | 1.91                   | 1.62          | 1.74        | 1.64       |
| INCOME   |             | 4.65             | 3.63             | 3.39             | 3.65                   | 3.44          | 2.67        | 2.90       |
|          |             | 2.46             | 2.60             | 2.13             | 2.26                   | 2.23          | 1.92        | 1.79       |
| INCOMEWP |             | 2.70             | 2.38             | 2.26             | 2.44                   | 2.28          | 2.20        | 2.00       |
|          |             | 1.06             | 1.26             | 1.14             | 1.24                   | 1.11          | 1.01        | .82        |
| EXPINCOM |             | 3.96             | 3.69             | 3.83             | 3.87                   | 3.66          | 3.93        | 3.70       |
|          |             | 1.57             | 1.74             | 1.64             | 1.65                   | 1.44          | 1.58        | 1.25       |
| RELPREF  |             | 1.25             | 1.44             | 1.65             | 1.69                   | 1.68          | 1.33        | 2.00       |
|          |             | 1.03             | 1.09             | 1.40             | 1.58                   | 1.51          | 1.29        | 1.89       |
| URBNRURL |             | 2.65             | 2.38             | 2.91             | 2.52                   | 2.88          | 2.33        | 2.40       |
|          |             | 1.11             | .89              | 1.11             | 1.13                   | 1.27          | .90         | 1.17       |
| REGION   |             | 2.13             | 2.00             | 1.87             | 1.80                   | 2.13          | 1.86        | 1.20       |
|          |             | 1.90             | 1.63             | 1.60             | 1.46                   | 1.61          | 1.56        | .63        |
| NUMCHILD |             | 1.75             | 1.94             | 2.00             | 2.03                   | 2.12          | 2.07        | 1.50       |
|          |             | 1.07             | 1.06             | 1.24             | 1.28                   | 1.21          | 1.28        | 1.08       |
| EDUCATN  |             | 4.88             | 4.50             | 4.57             | 4.49                   | 4.68          | 4.20        | 4.30       |
|          |             | .95              | .97              | 1.24             | 1.27                   | 1.04          | 1.15        | .82        |

<sup>a</sup> "From the following list check those that definitely influenced you in your learning about and preparation for marriage." (1 = checked; 0 = blank)

SEXUAL ROLE VARIATES: PARSIMONIOUS MODEL OF 1-WAY EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup> Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are classifiers, and 2- and 3-way interacting variates are removed.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p <  | R    | Univariate F | p <  | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| M <sup>c</sup>  | ATTSEX   | 4.37(30,1242)                    | .001 | .493 | 10.57(5,315) | .001 | .496                                   |
|                 | DSSXFANT |                                  |      |      | 9.34( " )    | .001 | .458                                   |
|                 | SEXMOST  |                                  |      |      | 4.05( " )    | .001 | .216                                   |
|                 | IMMATURE |                                  |      |      | 3.49( " )    | .004 | -.183                                  |
|                 | FSEXTALK |                                  |      |      | 3.07( " )    | .010 | -.174                                  |
|                 | VARIETY  |                                  |      |      | 4.48( " )    | .001 | .142                                   |
| P               | FSEXTALK | 2.13(18,883)                     | .004 | .301 | 3.05(6,314)  | .006 | .821                                   |
|                 | MPSXPLAY |                                  |      |      | 1.54( " )    | .163 | .684                                   |
|                 | MAXSXTIM |                                  |      |      | 1.45( " )    | .195 | .297                                   |
| F               | FSEXTALK | 1.91(20,1036)                    | .009 | .238 | 1.92(5,315)  | .090 | -1.121                                 |
|                 | DSSXFANT |                                  |      |      | 1.86( " )    | .102 | .441                                   |
|                 | HARDTALK |                                  |      |      | 2.39( " )    | .038 | -.331                                  |
|                 | FOREPLAY |                                  |      |      | 1.98( " )    | .082 | -.329                                  |
|                 |          |                                  |      |      |              |      |                                        |

<sup>a</sup> These are not unbiased estimates arrived at after other sources of variation were tested in the same 3-way model. Rather, they are the results of simple 1-way classifications taken independently. Each variate set is ordered by descending standardized discriminant function coefficients, thus, in order of decreasing independent contribution to the explanatory model.

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

<sup>c</sup> The addition of 4 more variables, each univariately significant, did not enhance explanatory power.

|   |          |              |      |      |              |      |       |
|---|----------|--------------|------|------|--------------|------|-------|
| M |          | 3.19(50,399) | .001 | .496 |              |      |       |
|   | ATTSEX   |              |      |      | 10.57(5,315) | .001 | .482  |
|   | DSSXFANT |              |      |      | 9.34( " )    | .001 | .460  |
|   | FSEXTALK |              |      |      | 3.07( " )    | .010 | -.196 |
|   | SEXMOST  |              |      |      | 4.05( " )    | .001 | .195  |
|   | IMMATURE |              |      |      | 3.49( " )    | .004 | -.170 |
|   | VARIETY  |              |      |      | 4.48( " )    | .001 | .118  |
|   | MAKENJOY |              |      |      | 2.89( " )    | .014 | .099  |
|   | MPROVSEX |              |      |      | 2.85( " )    | .016 | .093  |
|   | DSSXDES  |              |      |      | 3.42( " )    | .005 | -.085 |
|   | SEXCOMM  |              |      |      | 2.36( " )    | .040 | -.028 |

## APPENDIX F-2

MARITAL ROLE VARIATES: PARSIMONIOUS MODEL OF 1-WAY EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup> Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are classifiers, and 2- and 3-way interacting variates are removed.

| SV <sup>b</sup> Variate | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| M <sup>c</sup>          | 3.94(20,1036)                    | .001 | .396 |              |      |                                        |
| NEWFORMS                |                                  |      |      | 7.81(5,315)  | .001 | .627                                   |
| TRIALREL                |                                  |      |      | 5.50( " )    | .001 | .599                                   |
| PRSNGROW                |                                  |      |      | 3.31( " )    | .006 | .479                                   |
| LIVTOGB4                |                                  |      |      | 5.61( " )    | .001 | .368                                   |
| P                       |                                  |      |      |              |      |                                        |
| LOVVSLEG                |                                  |      |      | 2.16(6,314)  | .046 |                                        |
| F <sup>d</sup>          |                                  |      |      |              |      |                                        |

<sup>a</sup> These are not unbiased estimates arrived at after other sources of variation were tested in the same 3-way model. Rather, they are the results of simple 1-way classifications taken independently. Each variate set is ordered by descending standardized discriminant function coefficients, thus, in order of decreasing independent contribution to the explanatory model.

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

<sup>c</sup> The addition of 3 more variables, each univariately significant, did not enhance explanatory power.

|          |               |      |      |             |      |       |
|----------|---------------|------|------|-------------|------|-------|
| M        | 3.37(35,1302) | .001 | .402 |             |      |       |
| NEWFORMS |               |      |      | 7.81(5,315) | .001 | .502  |
| TRIALREL |               |      |      | 5.50( " )   | .001 | .425  |
| PRSNGROW |               |      |      | 3.31( " )   | .006 | .345  |
| LIVTOGB4 |               |      |      | 5.61( " )   | .001 | .211  |
| DIVORCE  |               |      |      | 3.41( " )   | .005 | .169  |
| LOVVSLEG |               |      |      | 4.38( " )   | .001 | .146  |
| FIVEYEAR |               |      |      | 4.44( " )   | .001 | -.072 |

<sup>d</sup> Though in concert PRSNGROW, LOVVSLEG, NOWEDDNG, CONTRACT, FIVEYEAR approached a multivariate F significant at  $p < .05$ , none of these were significant in univariate F,  $p < .10$ . The best set was not possible, since intercorrelations caused exponent overflow. The whole set has been deleted as of a very low order of significance.

COMPANION ROLE VARIATES: PARSIMONIOUS MODEL OF 1-WAY EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup>  
 Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM  
 are classifiers, and 2- and 3-way interacting variates are removed.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| M               |          | 2.41(25,1157)                    | .001 | .312 |              |      |                                        |
|                 | DSDREAMS |                                  |      |      | 3.31(5,315)  | .006 | .734                                   |
|                 | OPENCOMM |                                  |      |      | 3.47( " )    | .005 | .629                                   |
|                 | NTTLKIMP |                                  |      |      | 2.41( " )    | .037 | .503                                   |
|                 | FRSTTONO |                                  |      |      | 3.08( " )    | .01  | .498                                   |
|                 | XPRSANGR |                                  |      |      | 2.89( " )    | .014 | .435                                   |
| P               |          | 2.67(18,883)                     | .001 | .321 |              |      |                                        |
|                 | NTTALK   |                                  |      |      | 2.08(6,314)  | .055 | -.677                                  |
|                 | DSDISLIK |                                  |      |      | 3.15( " )    | .005 | .616                                   |
|                 | OPENCOMM |                                  |      |      | 2.95( " )    | .008 | .563                                   |
| F <sup>c</sup>  |          | 2.55(15,864)                     | .001 | .264 |              |      |                                        |
|                 | XPRSANGR |                                  |      |      | 2.60(5,315)  | .025 | -.688                                  |
|                 | MPFRETIM |                                  |      |      | 2.72( " )    | .020 | -.615                                  |
|                 | MPHLPGRO |                                  |      |      | 2.70( " )    | .021 | -.418                                  |

<sup>a</sup> These are not unbiased estimates arrived at after other sources of variation were tested in the same 3-way model. Rather, they are the results of simple 1-way classifications taken independently. Each variate set is ordered by descending standardized discriminant function coefficients, thus, in order of decreasing independent contribution to the explanatory model.

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

<sup>c</sup> In the F-way set NTTLKIMP should also be included. Although its univariate  $F=2.18(5,315)$  was only significant at  $p<.056$ , its discriminant function coefficient in every combination indicated it contributes greatly to the set. The 4-variate set could not be obtained due to high intercorrelations among the four, resulting in exponent overflow error. MPHLPGRO and NTTLKIMP were most highly correlated to the others in the set, and XPRSANGR least correlated, thus adding more of a unique dimension. The above set maximized  $p$  levels for the univariate set and left  $R$  virtually unchanged from the highest  $R$  obtained for any set of 3 from among these 4 (highest was  $R=.268$ ).

PARENTAL ROLE VARIATES: PARSIMONIOUS MODEL OF 1-WAY EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup>  
 Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM  
 are classifiers, and 2- and 3-way interacting variates are removed.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| M               | ATTFEM   | 2.22(25,1157)                    | .001 | .344 | 4.87(5,315)  | .001 | .492                                   |
|                 | NATUBRTH |                                  |      |      | 2.74( " )    | .020 | .430                                   |
|                 | ATTABORT |                                  |      |      | 2.85( " )    | .016 | .284                                   |
|                 | POPUCRIS |                                  |      |      | 2.68( " )    | .022 | .240                                   |
|                 | ADOPTKID |                                  |      |      | 2.20( " )    | .054 | .164                                   |
|                 |          |                                  |      |      |              |      |                                        |
| P <sup>c</sup>  | MPEDUCAT | 2.15(18,883)                     | .004 | .259 | 2.54(6,314)  | .021 | -.856                                  |
|                 | RAISKIDS |                                  |      |      | 1.82( " )    | .094 | .450                                   |
|                 | TWOCHILD |                                  |      |      | 2.20( " )    | .043 | -.356                                  |
|                 |          |                                  |      |      |              |      |                                        |
| F               | RAISKIDS | 3.01(10,628)                     | .001 | .284 | 4.40(5,315)  | .001 | .840                                   |
|                 | ATTFEM   |                                  |      |      | 2.08( " )    | .067 | -.478                                  |

<sup>a</sup> These are not unbiased estimates arrived at after other sources of variation were tested in the same 3-way model. Rather, they are the results of simple 1-way classifications taken independently. Each variate set is ordered by descending standardized discriminant function coefficients, thus, in order of decreasing independent contribution to the explanatory model.

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

<sup>c</sup> KIDSWANT also belongs in the P-way set with univariate  $F=1.97(6,314)$ ,  $p<.069$ . Intercorrelations caused exponent overflow error. Substantively, KIDSWANT and TWOCHILD are very similar dimensions.  $R=.259$  was highest of 3 combinations of 3 variates checked. Others were  $R=.253$ ,  $R=.236$ , RAISKIDS, KIDSWANT and MPEDUCAT, however, remain to be tested.

## APPENDIX F-5

LEISURE ROLE VARIATES: PARSIMONIOUS MODEL OF 1-WAY EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup> Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are classifiers, and 2- and 3-way interacting variates are removed.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| M               | NTPAINT  | 2.44(35,1302)                    | .001 | .328 | 3.20(5,315)  | .008 | -19.646                                |
|                 | NTHOBBY  |                                  |      |      | 3.14( " )    | .009 | -13.000                                |
|                 | PBUDGSOC |                                  |      |      | 2.49( " )    | .032 | 12.626                                 |
|                 | MAKEFUN  |                                  |      |      | 2.44( " )    | .034 | - 9.815                                |
|                 | NTARTEXP |                                  |      |      | 2.11( " )    | .064 | - 7.595                                |
|                 | DSLEISMN |                                  |      |      | 3.05( " )    | .011 | - 4.955                                |
|                 | SOCBUDGT |                                  |      |      | 3.28( " )    | .007 | - 4.930                                |
| P               | NTDINOUT | 2.20(24,1086)                    | .001 | .304 | 2.53(6,314)  | .021 | - .831                                 |
|                 | NTDOITUR |                                  |      |      | 2.65( " )    | .016 | - .807                                 |
|                 | SOCVISIT |                                  |      |      | 1.57( " )    | .155 | - .136                                 |
|                 | MAKEFUN  |                                  |      |      | 2.23( " )    | .040 | .083                                   |
| F               | SOCVISIT | 2.97(20,1036)                    | .001 | .334 | 5.02(5,315)  | .001 | - .672                                 |
|                 | NTARTEXP |                                  |      |      | 2.93( " )    | .013 | - .436                                 |
|                 | NTERTAIN |                                  |      |      | 2.74( " )    | .019 | .334                                   |
|                 | NTHOBBY  |                                  |      |      | 2.55( " )    | .028 | - .135                                 |

<sup>a</sup> These are not unbiased estimates arrived at after other sources of variation were tested in the same 3-way model. Rather, they are the results of simple 1-way classifications taken independently. Each variate set is ordered by descending standardized discriminant function coefficients, this, in order of decreasing independent contribution to the explanatory model.

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.



## APPENDIX F-6

ECONOMIC ROLE VARIATES: PARSIMONIOUS MODEL OF 1-WAY EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup>

Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are classifiers, and 2- and 3-way interacting variates are removed.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| M               | HWFAMINC | 2.942(10,628)                    | .001 | .234 | 3.63(5,315)  | .003 | .938                                   |
|                 | MPWIFCAR |                                  |      |      | 2.75( " )    | .019 | .112                                   |
| P               | MPCOOK   |                                  |      |      | 3.24(6,314)  | .004 | .320                                   |
| F               | MPLABSAV | 2.52(20,1036)                    | .001 | .312 | 5.91(5,315)  | .001 | .776                                   |
|                 | MPHUSJOB |                                  |      |      | 2.96( " )    | .012 | .372                                   |
|                 | MPCOOK   |                                  |      |      | 2.84( " )    | .016 | .089                                   |
|                 | MPHOUSE  |                                  |      |      | 2.34( " )    | .042 | .031                                   |

<sup>a</sup> These are not unbiased estimates arrived at after other sources of variation were tested in the same 3-way model. Rather, they are the results of simple 1-way classifications taken independently. Each variate set is ordered by descending standardized discriminant function coefficients, thus, in order of decreasing independent contribution to the explanatory model.

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

## APPENDIX F-7

SEXUAL ROLE VARIATES, M-WAY CLASSIFICATION,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | ATTSEX       | DSSXFANT     | SEXMOST      | IMMATURE     | FSEXALK      |
|--------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| M      |     |              |              |              |              |              |
| 1      | 3   | 2.67<br>2.08 | 2.00<br>1.00 | 4.33<br>1.53 | 5.33<br>1.16 | 4.00<br>1.73 |
| 2      | 17  | 1.77<br>0.75 | 3.24<br>1.89 | 3.00<br>1.50 | 4.77<br>1.48 | 3.35<br>1.80 |
| 3      | 105 | 2.15<br>1.00 | 4.02<br>1.51 | 3.64<br>1.20 | 4.21<br>1.20 | 3.15<br>1.56 |
| 4      | 87  | 2.67<br>1.00 | 4.55<br>1.26 | 3.81<br>1.13 | 4.06<br>1.21 | 2.72<br>1.42 |
| 5      | 57  | 3.16<br>1.03 | 4.77<br>1.13 | 4.19<br>1.11 | 3.63<br>1.23 | 2.42<br>1.34 |
| 6      | 52  | 2.87<br>1.07 | 5.04<br>1.25 | 4.17<br>1.38 | 3.85<br>1.50 | 2.62<br>1.29 |
| Factor | n   | VARIETY      | MAKENJOY     | MPROVSEX     | DSSXDES      | SEXCOMM      |
| M      |     |              |              |              |              |              |
| 1      | 3   | 2.67<br>2.89 | 2.00<br>1.73 | 4.33<br>2.89 | 1.33<br>0.58 | 4.00<br>1.73 |
| 2      | 17  | 1.41<br>0.62 | 1.47<br>0.72 | 2.82<br>1.55 | 2.06<br>1.35 | 2.53<br>1.13 |
| 3      | 105 | 1.87<br>0.82 | 1.58<br>0.72 | 3.06<br>1.22 | 2.58<br>1.36 | 2.85<br>1.06 |
| 4      | 87  | 2.28<br>0.92 | 1.82<br>0.76 | 3.45<br>1.18 | 2.90<br>1.24 | 2.98<br>1.22 |
| 5      | 57  | 2.26<br>0.88 | 2.02<br>0.95 | 3.61<br>1.39 | 3.04<br>1.45 | 3.32<br>1.30 |
| 6      | 52  | 2.19<br>1.10 | 1.65<br>0.84 | 3.65<br>1.68 | 3.15<br>1.43 | 3.23<br>1.42 |

## APPENDIX F-7 (continued)

SEXUAL ROLE VARIATES, P-WAY CLASSIFICATION,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | FSEXTALK     | MPSXPLAY     | MAXSXTIM     |
|--------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| P      |     |              |              |              |
| 7      | 37  | 2.89<br>1.61 | 1.97<br>0.99 | 3.62<br>1.53 |
| 6      | 148 | 2.69<br>1.41 | 1.93<br>0.81 | 3.60<br>1.41 |
| 5      | 76  | 3.05<br>1.50 | 2.07<br>0.75 | 3.83<br>1.46 |
| 4      | 40  | 2.50<br>1.28 | 1.83<br>0.84 | 3.85<br>1.35 |
| 3      | 10  | 3.30<br>1.64 | 1.50<br>0.71 | 4.60<br>1.51 |
| 2      | 8   | 3.63<br>1.69 | 2.13<br>0.84 | 3.88<br>1.96 |
| 1      | 2   | 6.00<br>0.0  | 3.00<br>0.0  | 5.50<br>0.71 |

SEXUAL ROLE VARIATES, F-WAY CLASSIFICATION,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n  | FSEXTALK     | DSSXFANT     | HARDTALK     | FOREPLAY     |
|--------|----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| F      |    |              |              |              |              |
| 1      | 56 | 3.13<br>1.47 | 3.96<br>1.64 | 5.00<br>1.13 | 3.66<br>1.01 |
| 2      | 82 | 2.99<br>1.55 | 4.47<br>1.39 | 5.02<br>1.09 | 3.63<br>1.13 |
| 3      | 56 | 2.82<br>1.44 | 4.38<br>1.51 | 4.86<br>1.41 | 3.39<br>1.11 |
| 4      | 59 | 2.81<br>1.47 | 4.48<br>1.37 | 4.92<br>1.19 | 3.14<br>1.22 |
| 5      | 49 | 2.61<br>1.54 | 4.78<br>1.21 | 4.37<br>1.40 | 3.61<br>1.04 |
| 6      | 19 | 2.05<br>0.85 | 4.21<br>1.55 | 4.42<br>1.61 | 3.37<br>1.21 |

MARITAL ROLE VARIATES, M-WAY CLASSIFICATION,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | NEWFORMS     |              | TRIALREL     | PRSNNGROW    |
|--------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| M      |     |              |              |              |              |
| 1      | 3   | 1.33<br>0.58 |              | 5.00<br>1.73 | 1.00<br>0.0  |
| 2      | 17  | 3.06<br>1.30 |              | 4.47<br>1.33 | 1.29<br>0.77 |
| 3      | 105 | 3.49<br>1.31 |              | 4.51<br>1.40 | 1.47<br>0.57 |
| 4      | 87  | 3.89<br>1.21 |              | 4.91<br>1.14 | 1.78<br>0.72 |
| 5      | 57  | 4.11<br>1.35 |              | 5.05<br>0.93 | 1.54<br>0.68 |
| 6      | 52  | 4.46<br>1.43 |              | 5.48<br>0.78 | 1.52<br>0.73 |
| Factor | n   | LIVTOGB4     | DIVORCE      | LOVVSLEG     | FIVEYEAR     |
| M      |     |              |              |              |              |
| 1      | 3   | 2.67<br>1.53 | 4.67<br>1.53 | 4.33<br>1.53 | 4.67<br>2.31 |
| 2      | 17  | 2.88<br>1.11 | 4.12<br>1.11 | 3.12<br>1.27 | 3.65<br>1.27 |
| 3      | 105 | 3.54<br>1.49 | 4.28<br>1.21 | 3.30<br>1.65 | 4.31<br>1.51 |
| 4      | 87  | 3.89<br>1.47 | 4.43<br>1.07 | 3.60<br>1.54 | 4.53<br>1.24 |
| 5      | 57  | 4.37<br>1.63 | 4.60<br>1.21 | 4.14<br>1.51 | 4.83<br>1.28 |
| 6      | 52  | 4.44<br>1.53 | 5.02<br>1.11 | 4.29<br>1.64 | 5.12<br>1.25 |

MARITAL ROLE VARIATES, P-WAY CLASSIFICATION,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | LOVVSLEG     |
|--------|-----|--------------|
| P      |     |              |
| 7      | 37  | 4.11<br>1.73 |
| 6      | 148 | 3.91<br>1.60 |
| 5      | 76  | 3.25<br>1.52 |
| 4      | 40  | 3.50<br>1.68 |
| 3      | 10  | 3.30<br>1.42 |
| 2      | 8   | 3.25<br>1.39 |
| 1      | 2   | 3.50<br>2.12 |

## APPENDIX F-9

COMPANIONATE ROLE VARIATES, M-WAY CLASSIFICATION,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | DSDREAMS | OPENCOMM | NTTLKIMP | FRSTTONO | XPRSANGR |
|--------|-----|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| M      |     |          |          |          |          |          |
| 1      | 3   | 1.67     | 1.00     | 1.00     | 1.00     | 2.67     |
|        |     | 1.16     | 0.0      | 0.0      | 0.0      | 2.89     |
| 2      | 17  | 2.35     | 1.47     | 1.59     | 1.88     | 1.77     |
|        |     | 1.00     | 0.72     | 0.94     | 1.36     | 0.97     |
| 3      | 105 | 2.95     | 2.28     | 1.71     | 1.94     | 2.00     |
|        |     | 1.37     | 1.05     | 0.86     | 0.96     | 0.88     |
| 4      | 87  | 3.39     | 2.20     | 2.02     | 2.18     | 2.40     |
|        |     | 1.45     | 1.07     | 0.93     | 1.08     | 1.12     |
| 5      | 57  | 3.26     | 2.51     | 2.09     | 2.40     | 2.51     |
|        |     | 1.37     | 1.17     | 1.04     | 1.25     | 1.18     |
| 6      | 52  | 3.42     | 2.08     | 2.00     | 1.75     | 2.23     |
|        |     | 1.35     | 1.17     | 1.22     | 1.10     | 1.17     |

COMPANIONATE ROLE VARIATES, P-WAY CLASSIFICATION,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | NTTALK | DSDISLIK | OPENCOMM | NTTLKIMP |
|--------|-----|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| P      |     |        |          |          |          |
| 7      | 37  | 1.19   | 4.38     | 2.51     | 1.73     |
|        |     | 0.40   | 1.72     | 1.22     | 1.10     |
| 6      | 148 | 1.55   | 4.28     | 2.39     | 1.94     |
|        |     | 0.71   | 1.72     | 1.16     | .98      |
| 5      | 76  | 1.62   | 3.45     | 2.00     | 1.93     |
|        |     | 0.75   | 1.60     | 0.91     | .94      |
| 4      | 40  | 1.48   | 4.05     | 1.78     | 1.80     |
|        |     | 0.72   | 1.80     | 0.83     | 1.02     |
| 3      | 10  | 1.70   | 3.60     | 2.20     | 1.90     |
|        |     | 0.95   | 1.78     | 1.03     | .99      |
| 2      | 8   | 1.88   | 2.88     | 1.75     | 2.25     |
|        |     | 1.13   | 1.46     | 1.49     | 1.17     |
| 1      | 2   | 1.50   | 3.00     | 2.00     | 1.00     |
|        |     | 0.71   | 0.0      | 1.41     | 0.0      |

COMPANIONATE ROLE VARIATES, F-WAY CLASSIFICATION  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n  | XPRSANGR     | MPFRETIM     | MPHLPGRO     |
|--------|----|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| F      |    |              |              |              |
| 1      | 56 | 2.11<br>1.07 | 1.91<br>0.61 | 1.91<br>0.82 |
| 2      | 82 | 2.20<br>1.00 | 1.99<br>0.76 | 2.04<br>0.85 |
| 3      | 56 | 1.96<br>0.89 | 1.68<br>0.66 | 1.70<br>0.76 |
| 4      | 59 | 2.20<br>1.11 | 1.70<br>0.65 | 1.75<br>0.84 |
| 5      | 49 | 2.61<br>1.13 | 1.84<br>0.75 | 2.06<br>0.88 |
| 6      | 19 | 2.63<br>1.61 | 1.53<br>0.61 | 2.32<br>1.06 |

M-WAY CLASSIFICATION, PARENTAL ROLE VARIATES  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor<br>M | n   | ATTFEM       | NATUBRTH     | ATTABORT     | POPUCRIS     | ADOPTKID     |
|-------------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1           | 3   | 2.67<br>1.53 | 3.67<br>1.16 | 3.00<br>2.00 | 1.67<br>1.16 | 4.33<br>2.89 |
| 2           | 17  | 2.41<br>1.12 | 2.77<br>1.25 | 2.00<br>0.94 | 1.59<br>0.87 | 2.06<br>1.25 |
| 3           | 105 | 3.30<br>1.18 | 3.16<br>1.56 | 2.36<br>1.35 | 2.23<br>1.33 | 2.72<br>1.54 |
| 4           | 87  | 3.24<br>1.14 | 3.01<br>1.24 | 2.44<br>1.34 | 2.44<br>1.37 | 2.75<br>1.41 |
| 5           | 57  | 3.60<br>1.05 | 3.23<br>1.60 | 2.79<br>1.22 | 2.58<br>1.32 | 2.86<br>1.58 |
| 6           | 52  | 3.79<br>1.09 | 3.89<br>1.77 | 3.02<br>1.49 | 2.73<br>1.37 | 3.21<br>1.74 |

P-WAY CLASSIFICATION, PARENTAL ROLE VARIATES  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor<br>P | n   | MPEDUCAT     | RAISKIDS     | TWOCHILD     | KIDSWANT     |
|-------------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 7           | 37  | 1.51<br>0.69 | 3.38<br>1.55 | 3.38<br>1.55 | 3.76<br>1.09 |
| 6           | 148 | 1.58<br>0.64 | 3.12<br>1.04 | 3.12<br>1.04 | 3.37<br>.81  |
| 5           | 76  | 1.70<br>0.75 | 3.24<br>1.21 | 3.24<br>1.21 | 3.53<br>.99  |
| 4           | 40  | 1.70<br>0.82 | 2.68<br>1.27 | 2.68<br>1.27 | 3.38<br>.77  |
| 3           | 10  | 1.60<br>0.84 | 3.30<br>1.34 | 3.30<br>1.34 | 3.10<br>.99  |
| 2           | 8   | 2.50<br>1.60 | 3.25<br>1.39 | 3.25<br>1.39 | 2.88<br>.99  |
| 1           | 2   | 1.00<br>0.0  | 4.50<br>0.71 | 4.50<br>0.71 | 4.00<br>0.0  |



## APPENDIX F-10 (continued)

F-WAY CLASSIFICATION, PARENTAL ROLE VARIATES  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n  | RAISKIDS     | ATTFEM       |
|--------|----|--------------|--------------|
| F      |    |              |              |
| 1      | 56 | 3.45<br>1.21 | 3.11<br>1.44 |
| 2      | 82 | 3.46<br>1.09 | 3.29<br>1.13 |
| 3      | 56 | 2.96<br>1.28 | 3.57<br>1.06 |
| 4      | 59 | 3.05<br>1.18 | 3.25<br>1.08 |
| 5      | 49 | 2.80<br>1.24 | 3.43<br>1.06 |
| 6      | 19 | 2.47<br>0.84 | 3.95<br>1.08 |

M-WAY CLASSIFICATION, LEISURE ROLE VARIATES  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | NTPAINT      | NTHOBBY      | PBUDGSOC     | MAKEFUN      |
|--------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| M      |     |              |              |              |              |
| 1      | 3   | 5.00<br>1.73 | 4.33<br>1.16 | 3.67<br>2.52 | 1.33<br>0.58 |
| 2      | 17  | 3.65<br>1.94 | 2.12<br>1.36 | 4.77<br>1.20 | 1.53<br>0.62 |
| 3      | 105 | 4.94<br>1.38 | 2.79<br>1.21 | 4.30<br>1.29 | 1.91<br>0.96 |
| 4      | 87  | 4.81<br>1.29 | 2.76<br>1.07 | 4.10<br>1.49 | 2.12<br>0.90 |
| 5      | 57  | 4.65<br>1.45 | 2.49<br>1.10 | 4.58<br>1.19 | 1.74<br>0.75 |
| 6      | 52  | 5.12<br>1.34 | 3.00<br>1.25 | 4.79<br>1.30 | 1.89<br>0.70 |

| Factor | n   | NTARTEXP     | DSLEISMN     | SOCBUDGT     |
|--------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| M      |     |              |              |              |
| 1      | 3   | 4.33<br>2.08 | 1.00<br>0.0  | 3.00<br>2.65 |
| 2      | 17  | 2.18<br>1.91 | 2.35<br>1.17 | 4.12<br>1.45 |
| 3      | 105 | 3.31<br>1.64 | 3.03<br>1.44 | 3.91<br>1.49 |
| 4      | 87  | 3.39<br>1.58 | 2.90<br>1.40 | 3.98<br>1.33 |
| 5      | 57  | 3.14<br>1.67 | 3.26<br>1.25 | 4.35<br>1.11 |
| 6      | 52  | 3.50<br>1.67 | 3.37<br>1.67 | 4.69<br>1.21 |

## APPENDIX F-11 (continued)

P-WAY CLASSIFICATION, LEISURE ROLE VARIATES,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | NTDINOUT     | NTDOITUR     | SOCVISIT     | MAKEFUN      |
|--------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| P      |     |              |              |              |              |
| 7      | 37  | 1.54<br>0.70 | 2.16<br>1.14 | 2.92<br>1.19 | 1.78<br>0.89 |
| 6      | 148 | 1.85<br>0.84 | 2.53<br>1.19 | 3.05<br>1.24 | 2.07<br>0.90 |
| 5      | 76  | 1.92<br>0.80 | 2.58<br>1.36 | 3.00<br>1.17 | 1.82<br>0.83 |
| 4      | 40  | 1.78<br>0.80 | 2.63<br>1.46 | 2.95<br>1.32 | 1.65<br>0.70 |
| 3      | 10  | 1.90<br>0.74 | 2.20<br>1.23 | 3.80<br>0.92 | 1.50<br>0.53 |
| 2      | 8   | 2.50<br>1.31 | 4.00<br>1.41 | 4.00<br>2.00 | 1.88<br>0.64 |
| 1      |     |              |              |              |              |

---

F-WAY CLASSIFICATION, LEISURE ROLE VARIATES,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n  | SOCVISIT     | NTARTEXP     | NTERTAIN     | NTHOBBY      |
|--------|----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| F      |    |              |              |              |              |
| 1      | 56 | 2.71<br>1.29 | 2.89<br>1.46 | 4.11<br>1.16 | 2.82<br>1.11 |
| 2      | 82 | 2.81<br>1.04 | 3.12<br>1.61 | 4.37<br>1.06 | 2.70<br>1.12 |
| 3      | 56 | 2.84<br>1.06 | 3.21<br>1.71 | 4.25<br>1.25 | 2.52<br>1.22 |
| 4      | 59 | 3.46<br>1.25 | 3.20<br>1.68 | 4.27<br>1.32 | 2.66<br>1.09 |
| 5      | 49 | 3.45<br>1.37 | 3.90<br>1.75 | 3.94<br>1.07 | 2.84<br>1.31 |
| 6      | 19 | 3.58<br>1.47 | 4.00<br>1.73 | 3.37<br>1.34 | 3.58<br>1.22 |

M-WAY CLASSIFICATION, ECONOMIC ROLE VARIATES,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | HWFAMINC     | MPWIFCAR     |
|--------|-----|--------------|--------------|
| M      |     |              |              |
| 1      | 3   | 1.67<br>1.16 | 4.00<br>2.65 |
| 2      | 17  | 3.41<br>1.18 | 3.18<br>1.38 |
| 3      | 105 | 3.39<br>1.18 | 3.83<br>1.58 |
| 4      | 87  | 3.24<br>1.11 | 3.69<br>1.30 |
| 5      | 57  | 3.58<br>1.07 | 4.05<br>1.23 |
| 6      | 52  | 3.85<br>1.06 | 4.40<br>1.43 |

P-WAY CLASSIFICATION, ECONOMIC ROLE VARIATES  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n   | MPCOOK       |
|--------|-----|--------------|
| P      |     |              |
| 7      | 37  | 2.32<br>0.94 |
| 6      | 148 | 2.41<br>0.84 |
| 5      | 76  | 2.80<br>1.11 |
| 4      | 40  | 2.83<br>1.17 |
| 3      | 10  | 3.10<br>1.60 |
| 2      | 8   | 2.63<br>1.06 |
| 1      | 2   | 4.00<br>2.83 |

F-WAY CLASSIFICATION, ECONOMIC ROLE VARIATES,  
CELL MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| Factor | n  | MPLABSAV     | MPHUSJOB     | MPCOOK       | MPHOUSE      |
|--------|----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| F      |    |              |              |              |              |
| 1      | 56 | 3.96<br>1.25 | 2.14<br>0.96 | 2.91<br>1.33 | 2.63<br>0.98 |
| 2      | 82 | 3.59<br>1.04 | 2.04<br>0.90 | 2.63<br>0.92 | 2.48<br>0.90 |
| 3      | 56 | 3.36<br>1.07 | 1.80<br>0.96 | 2.20<br>0.94 | 2.20<br>0.88 |
| 4      | 59 | 3.76<br>0.95 | 1.98<br>1.01 | 2.54<br>0.92 | 2.34<br>0.88 |
| 5      | 49 | 3.25<br>0.95 | 1.76<br>0.69 | 2.59<br>0.96 | 2.49<br>1.00 |
| 6      | 19 | 2.68<br>1.11 | 1.37<br>0.60 | 2.58<br>1.02 | 1.95<br>1.03 |

SEXUAL ROLE VARIATES: 2- and 3-WAY INTERACTION EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup> Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are classifiers.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| FPM             |          | 2.16(54,72.3)                    | .001 | .885 |              |      |                                        |
|                 | XPERIMNT |                                  |      |      | 3.88(18,26)  | .001 | .998                                   |
|                 | SEXCOMM  |                                  |      |      | 2.05( " )    | .046 | .510                                   |
|                 | SEXISFUN |                                  |      |      | 1.98( " )    | .055 | .202                                   |

<sup>a</sup> Interactions were based on analysis using only the following cells: F(1,3,4,6), P(3,5,7), M(2,3,5,6). There were no significant 2-way interactions, but various combinations of the variates MPSXPLAY, MAXSXTIM, FSEXTALK, DSSXFANT, MAKENJOY, and MPROVSEX resulted in multivariate F's significant at  $p < .05$  for PM or FM interactions. These complex effects are not reported here, but await further investigation of interaction effects.

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

MARITAL ROLE VARIATES: 2- and 3-WAY INTERACTION EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup> Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL AND FRENDTIM are classifiers.

| SV <sup>b</sup>  | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|------------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| FPM <sup>c</sup> | LIVTOGB4 | 1.85(54,72.3)                    | .007 | .812 | 2.25(18,26)  | .029 | 1.748                                  |
|                  | NEWFORMS |                                  |      |      | 2.21( " )    | .032 | -1.416                                 |
|                  | FIVEYEAR |                                  |      |      | 1.99( " )    | .054 | 1.266                                  |
| FM <sup>d</sup>  | MEETNEED |                                  |      |      | 3.70(9,26)   | .004 |                                        |
|                  | DSMARIGE |                                  |      |      | 2.66( " )    | .025 |                                        |
| PM <sup>d</sup>  | FIVEYEAR |                                  |      |      | 2.64(6,26)   | .039 |                                        |
|                  | NEWFORMS |                                  |      |      | 2.55( " )    | .044 |                                        |
|                  | DSMARIGE |                                  |      |      | 2.41( " )    | .055 |                                        |
| FP <sup>d</sup>  | DSMARIGE |                                  |      |      | 4.39(6,26)   | .003 |                                        |
|                  | NEWFORMS |                                  |      |      | 2.56( " )    | .044 |                                        |
|                  | LIVTOGB4 |                                  |      |      | 2.49( " )    | .049 |                                        |

<sup>a</sup> Interactions were based on analysis using only the following cells: F(1,3,4,6), P(3,5,7), M(2,3,5,6).

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

<sup>c</sup> The following combination increased R though the additional variates were not univariately significant at  $p < .05$ .

|     |          |                |      |      |             |      |        |
|-----|----------|----------------|------|------|-------------|------|--------|
| FPM |          | 1.53(90,111.2) | .017 | .905 |             |      |        |
|     | NEWFORMS |                |      |      | 2.21(18,26) | .032 | 1.641  |
|     | FIVEYEAR |                |      |      | 1.99( " )   | .054 | -1.461 |
|     | LIVTOGB4 |                |      |      | 2.25( " )   | .029 | -.858  |
|     | DSMARIGE |                |      |      | 1.47( " )   | .180 | -.822  |
|     | PRSNFILL |                |      |      | 1.68( " )   | .112 | -.745  |

<sup>d</sup> These variate sets have not yet been tested for Multivariate F statistics.

COMPANIONATE ROLE VARIATES: 2- and 3-WAY INTERACTION EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup>  
 Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM  
 are classifiers.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate                        | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F                         | p<                   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|
| FPM             | DSDISSAT<br>DSDISLIK           | 2.50(36,50)                      | .001 | .842 | 3.43(18,26)<br>1.89( " )             | .002<br>.067         | 1.080<br>-.267                         |
| FM              | NTTALK<br>MPHLPGRO<br>DSDISLIK | 1.98(27,70.7)                    | .012 | .751 | 2.45(9,26)<br>2.35( " )<br>1.88( " ) | .036<br>.043<br>.100 | .670<br>.610<br>-.490                  |

<sup>a</sup> Interactions were based on analysis using only the following cells:  
 F(1,3,4,6), P(3,5,7), M(2,3,5,6).

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.



PARENTAL ROLE VARIATES: 2- and 3-WAY INTERACTION EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup> Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are classifiers.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| FM              | BRESTFED | 2.42(18,50)                      | .007 | .730 | 3.20(9,26)   | .010 | 1.152                                  |
|                 | NATUBRTH |                                  |      |      | 1.99( " )    | .082 | - .326                                 |
| PM              | BRESTFED | 2.31(12,50)                      | .02  | .661 | 2.49(6,26)   | .049 | .792                                   |
|                 | TWOCHILD |                                  |      |      | 2.24( " )    | .071 | - .698                                 |

<sup>a</sup> Interactions were based on analysis using only the following cells: F(1,3,4,6), P(3,5,7), M(2,3,5,6).

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

LEISURE ROLE VARIATES: 2- and 3-WAY INTERACTION EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup> Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are classifiers.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p< | R | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------------------|----|---|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| FPM             | NTNITCLB |                                  |    |   | 2.16(18,26)  | .036 |                                        |

<sup>a</sup> Interactions were based on analysis using only the following cells: F(1,3,4,6), P(3,5,7), M(2,3,5,6).

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

ECONOMIC ROLE VARIATES: 2- and 3-WAY INTERACTION EFFECTS,<sup>a</sup> Using Deviation Contrasts, when MOVIESED, PRNTREL and FRENDTIM are classifiers.

| SV <sup>b</sup> | Variate  | Multivariate<br>F(df hyp,df err) | p<   | R    | Univariate F | p<   | Stand.<br>Discrim.<br>Funct.<br>Coeff. |
|-----------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| FPM             | MANYCAR  | 1.65(54,72.3)                    | .024 | .820 | 2.31(18,26)  | .025 | .906                                   |
|                 | OWNHOME  |                                  |      |      | 1.56( " )    | .149 | .502                                   |
|                 | MPSAVING |                                  |      |      | 1.72( " )    | .102 | .365                                   |
| FM <sup>c</sup> | MPSAVING |                                  |      |      | 3.28(9,26)   | .008 |                                        |
|                 | MANYCAR  |                                  |      |      | 2.98( " )    | .014 |                                        |
| PM <sup>c</sup> | MANYCAR  |                                  |      |      | 3.77(6,26)   | .008 |                                        |
|                 | DSFURNIT |                                  |      |      | 3.68( " )    | .009 |                                        |
|                 | WIFEEARN |                                  |      |      | 2.60( " )    | .041 |                                        |
| FP <sup>c</sup> | DSFURNIT |                                  |      |      | 3.14(6,26)   | .019 |                                        |
|                 | OWNHOME  |                                  |      |      | 2.76( " )    | .033 |                                        |

<sup>a</sup> Interactions were based on analysis using only the following cells: F(1,3,4,6), P(3,5,7), M(2,3,5,6).

<sup>b</sup> Sources of Variation.

<sup>c</sup> These variate sets have not yet been tested for Multivariate F statistics.